DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 029 388 EA 002 241

By- Johnson, Carroll F., Ed.; Usdan, Michael D., Ed.
Equality of Educational Opportunity in the Large Cities of America: The Relationship Between Decentralization and Racial Integration.
Columbia Univ., New York, N.Y. Teachers College.
Pub Date Nov 68
Note-198p.; Report of Proceedings of a Special Training Institute on Problems of School Desegregation (Teacher's College, Columbia University, N.Y., N.Y., July 10-12, 1968).
Available from-Teachers College Press, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, N.Y. 10027 ($1.00)
EDRS Price MF-$1.00 HC-$10.00
Descriptors-Black Power, Civil Rights, *Community Control, Compensatory Education, *Decentralization, Defacto Segregation, Dejure Segregation, Educational Needs, *Equal Education, Integration Plans, Race Relations, Racial Integration, Racially Balanced Schools, *School Integration, School Policy, School Superintendents, *Urban Schools
Identifiers-Coleman Report, Commission on Civil Rights 1967 Report, Urban Coalition

A 2-day institute examined the relationship between two central policy alternatives facing large city school districts: Decentralization and integration. Titles and authors of the 11 major addresses presented at the institute are as follows: (1) "Urban Schools: Issues in Responsiveness and Control," by John H. Fischer; (2) "Children Apart: Crisis and Conflict," by June Shagaloff; (3) "The Law, Race, and School Districting," by E. Edmund Reutter, Jr.; (4) "The Urban Coalition: Its Implications for School Systems," by James A. Kelly; (5) "Educational Priorities and the Handicap of Local Financing," by James E. Allen, Jr.; (6) "The Case for School Integration," by Thomas Pettigrew; (7) "The Increased Role of Federal and State Governments in Civil Rights Issues Affecting Education," by Stephen K. Bailey; (8) "Metropolitanism and the Issues of Social Integration and Administrative Decentralization in Large Cities," by Robert J. Havighurst; (9) "Some Perspectives on the Politics and Organization of Education," by Adolf A. Berle; (10) "Efforts to Desegregate and Decentralize the Administration of a Large City School System," by James F. Redmond; and (11) "Some Views on the Relationship between Decentralization and Racial Integration in Large City School Systems," by James Farmer. (JH)

ED029588

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

EQUALITY OF EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY IN THE LARGE CITIES OF AMERICA: THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN DECENTRALIZATION AND RACIAL INTEGRATION

Edited by

Carroll F. Johnson
Superintendent of Schools
White Plains, N.Y. and
Adjunct Professor
Teachers College
Columbia University

Michael D. Usdan
Associate Professor
Teachers College
Columbia University

Teachers College, Columbia University

ADDITIONAL COPIES:
Additional copies of the report are available at cost. If you wish additional copies, please address your request to Teachers College Press, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, New York, 10027. Please enclose check made out to Teachers College Press ($1.00 per copy).

A report of the proceedings of a Special Training Institute on Problems of School Desegregation funded by the U.S. Office of Education under the provisions of Title IV, Section 404, of Public Law 88-352, the Civil Rights Act of 1964. The Institute was held at Teachers College, Columbia University from July 10-12, 1968. Published by the Teachers College Press, Columbia University, in cooperation with the Department of Educational Administration, Teachers College, Columbia University.

EA 002 241

FOREWORD

Failure to provide equality of educational opportunity for all children is threatening the very structure of our society. The consequences of inadequate education are beginning to affect visibly all aspects of our national life--social, cultural, moral, economic and political--as well as to deny countless thousands of children the opportunity to live rich and full lives. Little wonder that many proposals are being advanced to overcome this failure.

The papers in this publication deal with proposals for decentralization, and examine the relationship between this type of administrative change and racial integration.

The papers were presented at an Institute sponsored by the Department of Educational Administration, Teachers College, Columbia University as part of the Twenty-Seventh Annual Superintendents Work Conference. These annual conferences are one way in which Teachers College, through its Department of Educational Administration, provides service to practicing administrators and at the same time keeps abreast of new developments. In the case of this Institute, the importance of the topic and the caliber of the consultants who participated have resulted in papers of timely significance to the general public as well as to educational administrators and other policymakers.

The contributions of the many individuals who made the Institute possible are acknowledged in the next section. Special thanks are due to the co-directors of the Institute, Carroll F. Johnson and Michael D. Usdan. They conceived of the Institute, arranged the program, conducted the proceedings, and edited the papers in this publication.

Arthur J. Lewis
Chairman
Department of Educational
Administration

Acknowledgements

We are indebted to a number of people for making this report possible. Of course, without the cooperation and financial assistance of the U.S. Office of Education it would have been impossible to have held the Institute, which focused upon issues of such transcendent importance to American society. We are particularly grateful to Gregory Anrig and Theron Johnson of the U.S. Office of Education for their interest and support of the Institute.

Arthur Lewis and our colleagues in the Department of Educational Administration and other Teachers College staff members were most cooperative. Particular thanks are due Sheldon Rothbell for his assistance in planning the program and to Richard Scher and Robert Burkhardt for recording the presentations and assisting us in the subsequent editing of the speeches.

JoAn Booth handled the press and other facets of the Institute's public relations with great efficiency. May we also express gratitude for the gracious secretarial assistance of Patti Silverman and Judith Poehler whose efficiency permitted us to meet various deadlines despite severe time constraints.

Finally, appreciation must be expressed to John Calam and the staff of the Teachers College Press, who,

because of their sensitivity to the timeliness and saliency of the topics discussed in this volume, were willing to proceed so expeditiously with this publication.

This report is divided into three sections. Section I consists of an introduction describing the rationale for the Institute and its objectives.

Section II is composed of the texts of the eleven major addresses that were presented at the Institute.

Section III concludes the report with some brief comments by the co-editors.

Carroll F. Johnson
Institute Co-Director

Michael D. Usdan
Institute Co-Director

November, 1968

CONTENTS

Page

SECTION I - INTRODUCTION 1

SECTION II - INSTITUTE PRESENTATIONS 11

URBAN SCHOOLS: ISSUES IN RESPONSIVENESS AND CONTROL
John H. Fischer, President, Teachers College, Columbia University 13

CHILDREN APART: CRISIS AND CONFLICT
June Shagaloff, National Education Director, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People 27

THE LAW, RACE, AND SCHOOL DISTRICTING
E. Edmund Reutter, Jr., Professor of Education, Teachers College, Columbia University 45

THE URBAN COALITION: ITS IMPLICATIONS FOR SCHOOL SYSTEMS
James A. Kelly, Assistant Professor of Education, Teachers College, Columbia University and Executive Associate, The Urban Coalition 61

EDUCATIONAL PRIORITIES AND THE HANDICAP OF LOCAL FINANCING
James E. Allen, Jr., New York State Commissioner of Education 69

THE CASE FOR SCHOOL INTEGRATION
Thomas Pettigrew, Associate Professor of Social Psychology, Harvard University 83

THE INCREASED ROLE OF FEDERAL AND STATE GOVERNMENTS IN CIVIL RIGHTS ISSUES AFFECTING EDUCATION
Stephen K. Bailey, Syracuse University 105

Page

METROPOLITANISM AND THE ISSUES OF SOCIAL INTEGRATION AND ADMINISTRATIVE DECENTRALIZATION IN LARGE CITIES
Robert J. Havighurst, The University of Chicago 125

SOME PERSPECTIVES ON THE POLITICS AND ORGANIZATION OF EDUCATION
Adolf A. Berle, Professor Emeritus of Law, Columbia University 139

EFFORTS TO DESEGREGATE AND DECENTRALIZE THE ADMINISTRATION OF A LARGE CITY SCHOOL SYSTEM
James F. Redmond, General Superintendent, Chicago Public Schools 153

SOME VIEWS ON THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN DECENTRALIZATION AND RACIAL INTEGRATION IN LARGE CITY SCHOOL SYSTEMS
James Farmer, Adjunct Professor, New York University 173

SECTION III - SOME CONCLUDING COMMENTS 191

APPENDIX A - WORK CONFERENCE AND INSTITUTE PARTICIPANTS 195

EQUALITY OF EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY IN THE LARGE CITIES OF AMERICA: THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN DECENTRALIZATION AND RACIAL INTEGRATION

SECTION I - INTRODUCTION

Problem Identification

The recent report of the President's National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders expressed fears that the nation was heading towards "urban apartheid." The Kerner Commission stated in unequivocal terms that if the tragic consequences of massive racial segregation were to be averted, the world's most affluent country must press more vigorously to ameliorate slum life and promote racial integration.

Large city school systems, of course, have been lashed by the nation's racial hurricane for some time. Despite considerable pressure to integrate urban schools, little has been done to eliminate *de facto* segregation. Indeed, demographic patterns reflecting Negro in-migration have increased segregation to such an extent that the majority of students enrolled in many of our largest public school systems are now Negro (see Table 1). The great majority of these students attend predominantly segregated

TABLE 1

Racial Composition of the Public School Enrollment of the Great Cities: Fall, 1966 (Per Cent)

	White	Other
Baltimore	37	63
Boston	74	26
Buffalo	64	36
Chicago	46	54
Cleveland	47	53
Detroit	43	57
Los Angeles	75	25
Memphis	49	51
Milwaukee	76	24
New York	50	50
Philadelphia	42	58
Pittsburgh	62	38
St. Louis	38	62
San Diego	90	10
San Francisco	44	56
Washington, D.C.	9	91

Source: Research Council of the Great Cities Program for School Improvement, Status Report: 1967 (Chicago: The Council, 1967).

schools.

It was not our purpose nor was it possible in a two-day Institute to reiterate or analyze in depth oft-discussed and important inter-related problems such as the exodus of the white middle class to suburbia, the difficulty of desegregating schools when housing patterns are segregated, and the inequality of educational opportunity that exists for urban youngsters who despite their special needs are educated in fiscally strained school districts that cannot emulate the programs of more affluent suburbs.

The major problems upon which the Institute focused--in a necessarily general and introductory way--reflect the current uncertainty and ambivalence about the strategies we as a society must follow in order to work our way out of our current racial dilemmas. Do we immediately push for school integration despite the massive obstacles? Or, on the other hand, do we recognize demographic realities and emphasize compensatory efforts to enrich ghetto schools? Will it be self-defeating if we push racial integration within the geographical confines of cities which are rapidly losing whites with whom Negroes would integrate? Or, is a more viable and realistic approach to be found in the developing concept of metropolitanizing urban problems?

Moreover, the validity of integration as a goal is now being questioned. The emergence of the Black Power movement, and the disillusionment of many moderate civil rights advocates with the nation's desegregation efforts have generated a strong thrust for community control of the schools. In other words, Black Power advocates and others insist that black schools should be run by black educational officials within the ghetto's segregated environment and that the goal of integration must be subordinated, for the time being at least. Recent developments in New York City and elsewhere have, of course, accentuated the issue of separatism.

School administrators particularly are impaled on the horns of this dilemma. On the one hand, the federal government and documents such as the Coleman Report and the U.S. Civil Rights Commission's Racial Isolation in the Public Schools have stressed the moral and educational obligation to pursue integration policies at all costs. On the other hand, segments of both the white and black communities are now demanding community dominance. Both white and black foes of integration rally behind decentralization plans for somewhat different reasons; the former because it will tend to preserve the lily-white sanctity of the neighborhood school, the latter because it will give the distrustful black community control of the education of its young. Thus we find urban school policy-makers confronted with somewhat contradictory cross-currents and strategies inherent in recent proposals to revise political and administrative arrangements for the public schools.

The paramount purpose of the Institute was to analyze the relationship of decentralization plans to the goal of integrating public schools in the nation's large cities. From San Francisco to New York and from Chicago to Miami, city school districts have recently faced a rising wave of demands for decentralization. Arguments for decentralization can be classified into three types: arguments for policy flexibility, arguments for citizen accountability, and arguments for avoiding riots. Arguments against decentralization focus upon two critical problems inherent in most proposals for decentralization: racial and socioeconomic homogeneity of small units, and differential patterns for resource allocation. The Institute concentrated on the former problem.

The escalating demands for decentralization of large city systems reflect increasing awareness of the need to make urban public schools more responsive to the communities they serve. This laudable goal, however, often has profound implications upon efforts to integrate schools. To draw school district boundaries around relatively homogeneous areas is to reduce the opportunity for schools to introduce "different" kinds of children to each other. Recognition of this problem leads some to view decentralization proposals as calls for the "balkanization" of a city.

Acceptance of plans to decentralize large city school systems in recent months has subordinated the desegregation thrust propounded by many civil rights adherents who believe in integration as the only ultimate solution to the racial crisis. It is believed by some that proponents of the burgeoning decentralization movement in our cities have not directly faced up to its implications for integration.

Bayard Rustin expressed the apprehensions of many in a speech to New York City's United Federation of Teachers on April 6, 1968. Mr. Rustin, a prominent civil rights leader, warned that school decentralization might be used "for institutionalizing one of the worst evils in the history of this society--segregation." Mr. Rustin pleaded that the goal of integration not be sacrificed to the demands of "white and black separatists." He commented:

> While I am prepared to recognize that some measure of decentralization is feasible and perhaps desirable, I would proceed very carefully, because we may end up creating and worsening more problems than those we solve . . . .[1]

While acknowledging that decentralization would reduce the barriers separating urban schools from their communities, Mr. Rustin warned of some of the "real dangers" of decentralization:

> There is a real danger of community school boards being taken over by radical groups--black and white, on the right hand and on the left--who are less interested in education than in racial and community politics . . .
>
> . . . The education of children is much too important to be subverted to such interests.
>
> After all the years of our struggle, we are now being asked to accept the idea that segregated education is in fact a perfectly respectable, perfectly desirable and perfectly viable way of life in a democratic society . . .

Mr. Rustin rejects this proposition and contends that school districts "should be sufficiently broad to include as wide a degree of quality integrated education as possible."

Institute Objectives

The major objective of the Institute was to analyze the various implications of decentralization plans for school desegregation. This crucial issue had not, in our estimation, been addressed as candidly and as comprehensively as it should have been. An airing of some of the facets of the issues raised by Mr. Rustin and others was called for at this pivotal juncture in the history of urban education--when some major school systems are poised to radically alter their organizational structure. The Institute could not and did not attempt to develop prescriptions for the complex organizational problems confronting large urban school systems. However, by generating much-needed analyses of these questions by some of the nation's leading educators, the Institute served a critically important function and filled an information vacuum on some pivotal issues. The Institute program was designed to generate discussion and debate which would lead, in turn, to a broader perspective of the issues and a heightened sensitivity to their nuances.

---

[1] Lissner, Will, "Rustin Warns on School Separatists," New York Times, April 7, 1968.

The following were some of the Institute's primary objectives:

1. to develop in the participants heightened awareness of the fact that the twin goals of integration and decentralization may be somewhat incompatible in some cases but are not necessarily mutually exclusive

2. to have the participants assess the pros and cons of school decentralization vis-a-vis the goal of integration more thoughtfully than has been done in some school systems

3. to create more appreciation of the fact that reorganization plans in some major cities are somewhat contradictory (Chicago's Board of Education, for example, has endorsed long range plans to construct a series of educational parks drawing students from large geographical areas of the city with integration remaining a priority goal. On the other hand, New York City is attempting dramatic

and exceedingly controversial decentralization efforts that emphasize local, neighborhood control and more geographically limited attendance areas. This approach would seem to deemphasize integration as a priority goal.)

4. to generate more understanding of the potentiality and feasibility of metropolitanism as a means of equalizing educational opportunity and desegregating schools

5. to heighten understanding of the increasingly influential role of the federal and state governments in the determination of major educational policy

Institute Participants

We invited as participants in the Institute only high ranking school administrators from some of America's major school systems. Inviting incumbents of the nation's major urban superintendencies to attend a conference of this nature assured the Institute the very significant "widening or multiplier effect" desired by the U.S. Office of Education's Equal Educational Opportunities Program in its policies and procedure guidelines.

It is appropriate to mention at this juncture another "widening or multiplier effect." Teachers College sponsors each summer a two-week work conference for some forty leading school administrators. The two-and-one-half day Institute program was integrated with the annual work conference. Thus the Institute's outstanding program was available not only to the very select invitees just described but to forty other leading administrators as well, many of whom are in urban situations and might very well move on to large city superintendencies. In any event, these superintendents from diverse school districts representing some thirty states have a vested interest in viable approaches to urban educational problems and certainly need to understand the implications of these issues in an interdependent society.

Appendix A lists Work Conference and Institute Participants and Consultants.

Evaluation

In planning an Institute of this type it is important to build in a systematic evaluation procedure. Consequently, political scientist, George LaNoue, and sociologists Seymour Warkov and David Wilder of the Columbia University faculty attended all conference sessions and interviewed each superintendent extensively about the relationship of the Institute to the desegregation and decentralization problems in their cities. Their full evaluation report has been submitted to the United States Office of Education but some of their conclusions merit brief repetition here.

Academicians, of course, are rather prone to insist that decision-makers take scholarly insights seriously in the creation of public policy, but, given the urban educational crisis, this insistence is not just a case of vocational myopia. The evaluators persuasively argue, first, that the social sciences can produce the needed information about the consequences of various policy alternatives to the desegregation-decentralization dilemma and second, that we can no longer make the kind of ad hoc "keep-the-boat-afloat" decisions that we have in the past. It is not only the future of a whole generation of urban children at stake, but the very life of the city itself. Further they report that, although this particular group of superintendents was generally open to social science research and in varying degrees of intensity had established relationships with local universities, some commented that the traditional training of school administrators is not one that creates much facility in handling research results. Currently, understandings do not exist between decision-makers and scholars about the priorities of problems to be researched, about the shape of the information to be produced, or about the way that information should be injected into the policy process. For their part, social scientists have not yet had the financial support or the coordinated energy to launch the kind of educational "Manhattan project" now needed. One concrete recommendation is that a center should be created in the Office of Education, a major university, or an educational laboratory to provide a clearing house for research on decentralization. The differences in the political and educational implications of such concepts as local school administrative autonomy on one hand, and community control on the other, are considerable. There is already a national constituency demanding information about the consequences of various kinds of decentralization models, but the extent of the evidence is only fragmentary.

SECTION II

INSTITUTE PRESENTATIONS

In his introductory address President John H. Fischer of Teachers College, a nationally prominent advocate of racial integration, articulates his view that "given the current state of race relations in the United States", arguments in favor of school decentralization are stronger than those against. President Fischer, who formerly was Superintendent of the Baltimore City Public Schools, declares that support for a greater measure of decentralization should not be taken as support for segregation. But before racial integration is likely to produce the benefits it could yield, black Americans must have greater opportunities to assert their own preferences, control their own destinies, and manage their own affairs.

URBAN SCHOOLS:

ISSUES IN RESPONSIVENESS AND CONTROL

John H. Fischer, President
Teachers College, Columbia University

In education, as in other fields, too much of what we do is still based on assumptions that are no longer valid. We continue to be too much influenced by the momentum of established practice, and too little by fresh insights into the nature of people and their possibilities. We need new mechanisms and new procedures, but we need more. We must be prepared to reconsider and radically revise some of our fundamental concepts about education and about the role of the school. The wide-spread insistence that the school be made more relevant to real life stems as often as not from limited knowledge about both education and life; but, as evidence of dissatisfaction with present arrangements, the demand for greater relevance in our institutions cannot be ignored.

The issues we must consider are important not only to school people and school systems, but to the whole of American society. Much more than the technical details of school administration are involved. What happens in our schools is certain to affect the peace and progress of our communities. Almost everybody is aware of that. What is less widely understood is the effect of educational neglect on the development of individual children. In today's world, to limit a child's education is to deprive him of part of his freedom.

No one need be told that city schools everywhere need more good teachers, more leaders with imagination and courage, better techniques and teaching materials, more modern buildings and more money. But above everything else we need greater clarity about the purposes of the public schools, about their relation to the needs of our people and about their power to lift the quality of life in this country.

No small part of the trouble in city schools is due to the fact that virtually everywhere in our country, even in the large cities, the poor and the disadvantaged are a minority. For most Americans it is abundantly true that we have never had it so good. Despite gaps between what we have and what we want, the schools that most American children attend are not bad. The country over, their graduates are better prepared for life in general, and for higher education in particular, than they have ever been before. Even the troubles commonly associated with urban schools are found only in certain parts of American cities. Elsewhere in the cities, in the suburbs, and in small towns, the typical citizen is satisfied that the majority of children are being well and effectively educated.

What such optimism overlooks, of course, is that the crises are occurring where the schools are facing--and failing--the most telling tests. To argue that traditional tasks are being performed satisfactorily is no answer at all. It is where the schools confront the most demanding problems that they are in the deepest difficulty. It is at these points that we make a mockery of the principles on which our society has long been said to rest. It is here that the failure of the schools could undermine the social order. To say that all is well except in a few rough spots is like saying that a little fire--or a small cancer--never hurt anybody.

Sir Eric Ashby, Vice Chancellor of Cambridge University and a student of university development, makes the point that an institution is the embodiment of an ideal and that to survive it must fulfill two conditions: It must be sufficiently stable to sustain the ideal which gave it birth, and sufficiently responsive to remain relevant to the society which supports it.

In the historical evidence supporting that generalization we can find cause for deep concern. To a substantial degree, the public schools in our central cities are failing on both counts. The ideal that gave birth to the American public school system is that all American children should enjoy equal opportunity. For vast numbers of those children, the meaning of that magnificent assertion is utterly invisible in the schools they now attend. Nor can we claim with any validity that our schools are sufficiently responsive to remain relevant to the clear needs of the cities that support them.

In the whole American credo no tenet is more firmly fixed than our devotion to equal opportunity. We cite it constantly as the fundamental principle in the whole structure of public education. We assert with great pride that in our schools every American child finds his birthright of opportunity and gets the start that will enable him to make his way as a free man in a free land. But now we are beginning to see that equality of educational opportunity is not enough. The schools must be viewed as the principal instrument by which we enable our children to come to maturity prepared to compete on fair terms in an open society. Because children begin life--even in this most affluent of societies--with such wide diversity of advantages and handicaps, it is not enough that schools be equal. That is obviously and necessarily a first step, but our sights must be fixed on devising whatever means are required to enable every child to develop to the maximum whatever potentiality he possesses. Whatever his possibilities, wherever he begins, the school, in company with other agencies, is obligated not only to do the best it presently can, but to muster the ingenuity and the dedication to do what is necessary. The time has come to provide--as a matter of deliberate public policy--whatever exceptional, unequal education a child needs in order to assure he, too, will enter the adult world with a fair start.

Much attention has been given in the last two years to James Coleman's massive study, "Equality of Educational Opportunity." Discussion has usually focused on the data showing that Negro children achieve better in integrated schools than in segregated ones. The finding of the study that may ultimately turn out to be the most significant, however, is that students who have a sense of control over their own destiny do better than those who are convinced that their own actions have little to do with what happens to them. Coleman has only documented what good teachers everywhere know--that a good school is one where children know they are welcome and respected; where every day they experience some measure of success; and where they are constantly reminded that what they do does really make a difference. We must make up our minds--not after another investigation and ten more pilot projects with acronoymic titles, but now--to create more schools like that in every city. It is not the ideal of equal opportunity that needs changing but the mechanisms we use to serve it.

The connection between the ideal of equal opportunity and the value we place on the local control of schools in this country is by no means accidental. It relates directly to Ashby's point that, to survive, an institution must remain faithful to the ideal it embodies, while simultaneously it responds to shifting circumstances. We invented and have retained our system of local school control because it offers the most reliable means of assuring that schools will be responsive--responsive to the needs of society and the needs of children. With appropriate regard for other sources of wisdom we have long believed that the purposes of schools should be largely determined by parents and other citizens who are nearest to the schools. It is precisely because so many parents and other citizens close to them now find the schools unresponsive that a state of crisis has become chronic in many of our city systems.

The ultimate test of any school system is found not in its organization chart, its curriculum guides, or its professional personnel policies. The only evidence that finally matters is what actually happens to individual children in particular schools. Here, in the school, is where the individual student receives or is denied the opportunity that is his birthright. Here the parent finds or is refused a sympathetic relationship with the public servants who have been employed to teach his children. Here the student experiences the concern, the warmth, the empathy, the skill, the understanding, that distinguish the teacher from the time-server. It is in the classroom, subject as it always is to the emotional climate of the school, that a pupil acquires or fails to acquire that critically important sense of his own possibilities, his importance as a person, his responsibility to his fellows and to the larger world. It is here that he gains or fails to gain a personal awareness of the relevance of learning and the significance of knowledge that is the beginning of intellectual growth. In the way it nurtures his view of himself, his world and his place within it, the school can determine not only whether the student will become an educated person, but whether he is even to be a free and self-respecting human being.

There are public schools that meet these criteria, but few of them are in the central cities--and the black ghettos have almost none. The faith that with appropriate action they could be achieved is the main force behind the drive for more localized power over local schools. Not every ghetto resident wants more of such power, and in some neighborhoods the degree of satisfaction is fairly high. Last summer, for example, in a study by the Center for Urban Education in the Bedford-Stuyvesant section of New York, a third of those interviewed rated the schools "good" and another third thought they were at least "fair." About half thought that parents should have some voice in the selection or transfer of teachers or principals.

It may well be true that the insistence on a larger measure of neighborhood autonomy comes from a relatively small number of articulate and agressive spokesmen. It is also possible that it comes from those who are most sensitive to advantages of good schools and the crippling consequences of poor ones. What can not be disputed is that the typical ghetto school is less well staffed, equipped, and supported than it must be to meet its responsibilities. Neither can it be denied that the curricula, the teaching procedures, and the supplementary services in these schools are on the whole failing to respond as they should to the clear needs of the children. The immediate question is whether those needs are more likely to be met by giving local parents and citizens a greater voice in setting policies, selecting staffs, and evaluating results.

With rare exceptions the best schools in this country are found where local citizens close to them have a hand and a voice in their establishment and control. State and national influences are important factors, as are large city boards and administrators, but it is neighborhood opinion and power that usually produce the most significant differences in school quality. A principal issue in respect to ghetto schools is whether the risks of segregation overbalance the probable advantages of local identification and initiative.

Given the current state of race relations in the United States, I am persuaded that the arguments in honor of more local control are stronger than those against it.

This is not to say that segregation should be our goal. It is to say that before racial integration is likely to produce the benefits it could yield, black Americans must have greater opportunities to assert their own preferences, to control their own destinies, to manage their own affairs. In this sense the use of Black Power can be beneficial not only to the Negro but to all Americans. The common task for all of us is to devise ways, in the governance of schools and other fields, to recognize the integrity of particular groups without denying the members of any group free access to the larger community. Translated into the language of educational policy and school administration, this could mean the establishment of districts within cities, or in metropolitan areas, with substantial internal autonomy but with full opportunity for students and staff members to move between districts; and with sustained communication and cooperation among these units, in programs and services.

The fact that a particular community happens to be populated largely by one race is no reason to deny the right of its people to make their own decisions, so long as those decisions are within the principles commonly accepted by a broader jurisdiction. This balance should be no more difficult to attain within a large city than within a state.

The problem, I am convinced, is less one of political organization than of readiness to adopt more flexible patterns of operation and relationships. Much of what is needed can be attained--indeed must be found--in the individual school.

To assure and encourage the necessary level of initiative and responsiveness in the school, we shall need something other than a redesigned chart of systemwide administrative controls. We shall need a truly radical conception of decentralization, for what is involved is creating means by which principals and faculties can obtain from their communities--far more regularly than they do now--both their signals and their rewards.

One way to bring this about would be to establish a group of parents and other citizens in every school, to work with the principal and teachers in devising more effective ways to find and interpret the needs of the community, and of its children; and to translate that interpretation into improved programs. Such a group could advise the school staff on educational priorities and objectives, on curriculum development, and on the types of services most likely to aid the students. It could submit to the local school board--at least annually--its appraisal of the school's success in meeting the problems which the community considers important.

Obviously, in such an arrangement there would be opportunities for error, and even for abuse. For this reason, where opinions differ significantly, the staff should also be free to express its views. Suitable safeguards would be required to avoid issuing statements that might be personally damaging; but the more general aspects of the appraisals should be made public.

Such a plan could have another important value. Since a normal obligation of every public school is to respond to its community's needs, it should become an unwritten rule and in time an officially adopted policy that no member of the professional staff will be selected or approved for promotion without a record of satisfactory accomplishment in the community in which he works. To allow for the probability that in any human situation difficulties may arise that reflect no personal failure, and since it may be presumed that at times teachers could be the victims of bias and bigotry, allowance for such contingencies would be necessary. It should, therefore, be relatively easy for a staff member who is not succeeding in one community to be transferred to another without prejudice. But, until he has demonstrated that in addition to customary professional qualifications he possesses the disposition and competence to respond well to community problems, no staff member should be eligible for a position of greater responsibility. Those who--after a reasonable number of chances--still fail to display a suitable capacity to respond to the people from whom they have accepted employment should be encouraged to take their talents elsewhere. With due process and humane treatment for all concerned, the inept should be discharged.

It is not enough for the community to have the power to set the tasks for its schools. When those tasks are well performed, the community should also be able to reward those responsible. The advisory group I am suggesting should therefore single out, for special attention and praise, staff members who render especially meritorious service to their pupils and their communities. The recognition and reward might range from a simple citation to public applause, or to additional pay or promotion. Here, too, I recognize inherent danger, for cheap popularity is not to be confused with distinguished performance; but the risk in that direction seems to me far less than the risk of maintaining personnel practices that, purporting to be objective, often turn out to be irrelevant.

So long as members of the school staff know that the principal source of approval and promotion is at the central headquarters, it is to that "community" that they will look for appraisal and recognition. As the typical city system now operates there is little incentive for a principal or a teacher to be deeply concerned about what his local community expects of him. So far as his professional progress is concerned, that community possesses neither carrot nor stick. The lines of authority, stimulation, and reward now center at a single point. Until that situation is altered and the local community is given a larger voice in setting expectations for the professional staff and rewarding their attainment, most other schemes for placing the control of schools in the hands of local citizens will remain exercises in futility and largely an illusion. We should be under no illusion, however, about the difficulty of putting such a scheme into effect. It is easy to predict the dire warnings about self-seeking groups that would use the schools for their own purposes. It will be said that teachers and other staff members are too insecure to agree to any such plan. Certainly it will produce new administrative difficulties, and it will play havoc with customary operating procedures.

But neither should we retain any illusion about the almost certain results of protecting the present state of affairs. Unless city schools become much more responsive than they now are to the needs of their local communities, we must expect grave consequences.

The issues before us are complex and difficult. Resolving them will call for clear vision, bold initiative, consummate artistry in conciliation, and no little courage. Above all, the accomplishment of the tasks we are discussing depends on faith in people and in the power of education.

There is nothing easy about this job, but it happens to be essential. The future of this country will be so crucially affected by the way it is done, that--if it is bungled--the final third of this century could be ruined for most Americans.

Miss June Shagaloff, Education Director for NAACP, emphasizes the importance of correcting racial imbalance in the public schools and of improving the quality of schools now attended by black children. As a special consultant who attended the entire Institute, Miss Shagaloff scores school administrators for not providing leadership in promoting school desegregation and for condoning the dangerous myth of the culturally deprived child. She also charges the educational establishment with resisting efforts to improve the quality of predominantly black schools. Too many educational administrators, she contends, lack the commitment and courage to change school systems in which it is not believed that black children can learn as well as white children.

CHILDREN APART: CRISIS AND CONFLICT

June Shagaloff, National Education Director,
National Association for the Advancement of
Colored People

Those who believe that protest demonstrations by Negroes in this country began in the last decade--with the bus boycott in Montgomery, Alabama or the sit-ins--simply do not know American history. Among the first protest demonstrations were those of Negro parents in the early part of the last century, who insisted that the Boston School Committee admit their children to the newly established free "public" schools. The rest of that century and the first fifty years of this century continued to be marked by the struggle of Negro parents, North and South, to make meaningful the phrase "equal educational opportunity"--through petitions, protest meetings, school strikes, picket lines, school boycotts, and, of course, litigation. In fact, permissive segregation of the public schools was not prohibited in New Jersey and Indiana until as late as 1948.

If the distant past gives little comfort, then the immediate past gives even less comfort. The public schools, and those directly responsible for school policies and school practices, are best characterized by their commitment to the status-quo and their resistance to change.

America's public schools continue to be organized and to function on the basis of color and class. The concept of equal educational opportunity, so often stated as a primary objective of public education in America, has never been the real or functional objective of those directly responsible for the public schools in our country.

Prior to 1954, the commitment was to the status quo of separate and unequal schools. After 1954, the commitment in the South was to the maintenance of segregation through scores of devices intended to evade the principle of the May 17 decision. Southern school districts quickly undertook a crash building program; replacing ancient, inferior segregated schools with new, but equally inferior, still segregated schools. After all the devious pupil placement plans were finally prohibited by the Federal Courts, the commitment was to maintain the greatest possible racial segregation.

The voluntary pupil transfer plans used extensively throughout the South have served this objective well. In the North, the commitment has been to racial containment in the public schools, based on attendance areas which follow the color line in housing; to the so-called "neighborhood school concept" in an attempt to justify racial containment; and to the concept of "the culturally deprived child" in an effort to justify the academic underachievement of Negro children in separate and unequal schools.

An increasing number of school systems in the South today are adopting, and adapting, these northern school policies and practices. It was not by accident that the former Superintendent of Schools in Nashville, Tennessee, sent a staff team North, some years ago, to look at Indiana's year-by-year plan of desegregation. Indiana's approach later became known through the South--in fact, the nation--as "the Nashville Plan." And I know of no better example of de facto segregation, Northern style, than the geographic zoning plan of desegregation submitted to the Federal Court by school officials in Clarksdale, Mississippi.

But the North, too, also borrowed and adapted. The voluntary pupil transfer plan, developed and known in the South as "freedom-of-choice," has become the model for the northern practice of "open-enrollment." North and South, this plan leaves intact the basic pattern of segregation.

In short, the leadership for change has not come from within the school establishment. The former Superintendent of Schools of one of America's most beautiful cities publicly honored a retiring, long-time member of his Board of Education for "never once rocking the boat."

Our country is now reaping the bitter rewards of this devastating pattern. There is a form of violence as final as the bullet: the continuation of segregated and criminally inadequate, criminally inferior, criminally neglected schools. Jonothan Kozol, who taught in the public school system of Boston, wrote a book entitled "Death at an Early Age" about this form of violence.

To go back to the May 17 decision itself--in particular to one of the five cases decided by the United States Supreme Court: Brown vs. the Board of Education in Topeka, Kansas.

Brown was Miss Brown, a Negro student who had been denied admission to an all-white school in Topeka, Kansas, a state which permitted racial segregation in the public schools.

In the other four cases, NAACP attorneys argued that--not only were the public schools segregated--but they were, in all respects, unequal to the schools provided for white students. In the Topeka case, a different argument was made. We compared the schools in Topeka provided for white and for Negro students. We examined physical facilities, classroom size, teacher-pupil ratio, teacher qualifications, curricula offerings, classrooms and library books. And we argued before the courts, ultimately before the United States Supreme Court, that the public schools provided for Negro students were not only equal to the schools for white students but, in every respect that we had examined, were superior. But, we argued, the very fact of racial segregation itself was educationally and psychologically damaging to Negro children.

This, of course, was the essence of the May 17 decision which held that in public education segregated schools were inherently unequal and discriminatory.

I, personally, have always thought it was unfortunate that the Supreme Court directed itself exclusively to the effects of segregation on Negro children when considerable testimony and evidence had also been presented on the devastating psychological and educational effects of segregation on white children.

In 1954, we weren't talking about de facto segregation in the North, but it didn't take much awareness to know that extensive segregation existed in school systems outside of the South.

It comes as no surprise to anyone here that we are demanding that school superintendents and school boards adopt policies of color consciousness--not to discriminate, but to end the discrimination of the past; or that Negro parents are insisting that school officials do more than simply remove the legal restrictions on race and color--and develop affirmative policies and practices affecting pupils, teachers, and administrators.

There are five states that have adopted state-wide policies calling for the correction of racial concentrations in the public schools: California, New Jersey, New York, Massachusetts--and a very limited policy in the state of Connecticut. Other states have adopted legislative action calling for consideration of racial balance in site selection; drawing school attendance areas; and consolidating school districts. On a local level, an increasing number of school systems throughout the North and West have adopted affirmative policies to eliminate or correct segretation-in-fact.

Most of the litigation is directed to the responsibility of school officials to end or correct racial concentrations in the public schools, regardless of cause. We contend--and virtually all of the litigation has been filed by the NAACP--that segregation in any form, regardless of cause, violates the equal protection clause of the 14th Amendment, and that school officials have a responsibility to correct such racial concentrations.

Most of the decisionsin cases brought before State Commissioners of Education, primarily in New York and New Jersey, have called for corrective action. In the state courts, in suits filed by Negro parents challenging de facto segregation, or suits filed by white parents protesting desegregation, most of the decisions have called for correcting racial concentrations regardless of cause. At the federal court level, four cases have been argued and decided, and these decisions are in conflict. In two cases, one originating in Kansas City, Kansas, and the other in Gary, Indiana, the federal district courts held that school officials did not have a constitutional responsibility to correct racial concentrations if they had not deliberately created racial concentrations. In the other two cases, one originating in Manhasset, New York, and the other in Springfield, Massachusetts, the court decisions are quite different. Here, the federal courts have held that school officials do have a constitutional responsibility to correct racial concentrations, regardless of cause. The U. S. Supreme Court, thus far, has refused to review any of these court decisions. In effect, then, all of the lower court decisions have been left standing.

The NAACP intends to bring as many cases as necessary on appeal before the United States Supreme Court, with the expectation that the United States Supreme Court will ultimately rule on the issues.

There is a federal court case just decided that relates directly to some of these issues. The case, decided by 73-year old Judge Julius Hoffman of the federal district court, was filed by the U. S. Department of Justice (under Title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act) against the South Holland, Illinois, Board of Education which maintained two virtually all-Negro elementary schools and four all-white elementary schools.

Judge Hoffman found that the South Holland School Board had violated the equal protection clause of the 14th Amendment by tailoring the neighborhood school concept to foster racial segregation through the selection of school sites; the drawing of boundaries for school attendance areas; discriminatory busing policies; and the assignment of teachers. He further held that boundaries had been drawn in such a way as to place white students in attendance zones that were not closest to the schools nearest their homes.

He charged finally that school officials had manipulated the neighborhood school policy in order to promote and to maintain racial concentration.

The court held that a school board may not purposely manipulate the neighborhood school attendance policy so as to conform to the racial composition of the neighborhoods in a school district. Nor may school officials take advantage of private residential discrimination. The court also held that the school board must give affirmative consideration to racial factors in allocating faculty, assigning pupils, selecting sites for new schools, and busing pupils.

Judge Hoffman stated, moreover, that community opposition and segregated residential patterns may not stand in the way of school desegregation. And, finally, he held that neither community pressure nor the preferences of individuals provides legal justification for the racial assignment of students or teachers.

Let me add here that we hope to bring before local school officials, and before the courts, school desegregation suits based on the June 18, 1968, decision of the United States Supreme Court prohibiting practices which prevent open occupancy housing. We believe that this recent decision constitutionally invalidates the neighborhood school policy when this policy is used or misused to maintain racially concentrated public schools.

In the last five years, over a hundred middle-sized cities and suburban school systems have either desegregated completely or taken very substantial desegregation steps. I believe, still, that if redrawing school attendance areas were to be programmed with racial desegregation as one of the objectives, we could achieve far greater physical desegregation of the schools than we have at the present time--even in the large cities. In the area of school desegregation, the problem is not the lack of administrative know-how, but the lack of intent to change.

Some communities, including New Haven, have adopted the Princeton Plan for junior high schools as well as elementary schools. In a number of school systems, both large and small, antiquated school buildings previously serving only Negro students have been closed, and Negro students reassigned. Other school systems have organized middle or intermediate schools.

One of the most interesting approaches is the plan which is generally described as the "magnet" school. Last fall, Providence, Rhode Island implemented a city-wide desegregation plan for all elementary schools. The established ratio of approximately 70% white students and 30% black students at each school was accomplished through several different approaches to pupil reassignment, including redrawing school attendance areas. One all-Negro elementary school, housed in a very old building, was closed and pupils reassigned to other schools. But another all-Negro elementary school was housed in a new building, and school officials felt that they could not afford to close it. Nor were they willing to assign white pupils to a school in the black ghetto. Instead, they reorganized the school as a special school serving mentally retarded and physically handicapped children throughout the city. Negro parents in the community, proud of their school, furiously demanded that the city-wide desegregation plan include this school. Many months later, after protest actions and community conflict, the school was reorganized to serve children throughout Providence on a voluntary basis. School officials enlisted a highly qualified faculty (including university personnel) and stressed academically orientated programs that were not available at any other school. The school opened with approximately 70% white students, 30% black students, and with a long waiting list of white children.

The "magnet" school is being used in Xenia, Ohio, a small community; and, more recently, in the well-to-do suburban school system of Evanston, Illinois.

Other middle-sized school systems are correcting racial imbalances. Berkeley, California, will open its schools this fall with a very effective city-wide desegregation plan based on the Princeton Plan. Long-range plans in Berkeley include the educational park. Sacramento, California, is engaged in a city-wide school reorganization to correct racial imbalances. Syracuse, New York, has implemented short-range plans and is committed to developing effective long-range desegregation plans. In St. Paul, Minnesota, one Negro elementary school was finally closed and Negro students assigned to existing schools. In San Mateo, California, a similar desegregation program has been implemented. Lansing, Michigan, is another community that is moving on this issue. And there are scores of additional school systems, primarily smaller in size, where action is taking place.

In short, when school officials themselves are willing to change the status-quo, it can be done effectively. In the largest number of school systems, however, recommendations for change proposed by citizens committees or special consultants--after months, sometimes years, of study--have been rejected, emasculated, or simply ignored. Detroit, under the former Superintendent of Schools, appointed a citizens' committee which submitted a very comprehensive report and recommendations. Very little action was taken. In San Diego, where Negro parents have recently filed a suit against the Board of Education and the Superintendent of Schools, a citizens' committee made a report calling for corrective action. No action was taken.

Scores of other cities have followed the same pattern: demands by Negro parents; community conflict; appointment of citizens committees or specialists by school officials to make recommendations for change; and, finally, inaction. Takoma (Washington), San Francisco, New York City, Portland, Columbus (Ohio), Mount Vernon (New York), Kansas City (Missouri), St. Louis, and Indianapolis, for example, have followed this routine. In my office, there are over 200 reports of citizens' or special advisory committees recommending changes to correct racial concentrations and to raise educational standards. In each instance, the recommendations on desegregation were ignored while the recommendations to raise educational standards were transformed to supplementary "compensatory" programs.

The issue, of course, is not the neighborhood school. First of all, the concept of the neighborhood is a concept based not on geography or distance, as many pretend, but on color and class. It is often said, "the closer Negroes get to the so-called neighborhood school, somehow, the more sacred the concept becomes." The concept of the neighborhood school was violated without a murmur for more than half a century while school officials transported white and black children all over a city (or a county) in order to arrange and maintain racial segregation.

The issue of busing is another phony issue. There are thousands of all-white school systems in this country that provide bus transportation for their pupils without ever calling it "busing." Some school desegregation plans require pupil transportation; others do not. We view busing as no more and no less than a means of transporting pupils. The real issue, of course, is not whether children ride school buses but where they go to school when they get off the bus.

Of all the myths that have been developed to justify segregated and unequal schools, or the academic underachievement of Negro children, the most vicious and dangerous myth is the concept of the culturally deprived or disadvantaged child as it is being used in American education today. Implicit in this concept is the belief that there is a direct relationship between a child's socio-economic background and his ability to learn. We don't need any more studies to tell us that children who are poor and black are underachievers in America's public schools. But we don't know of a single study suggesting that a child who is poor and black cannot learn. Dr. John Fischer, President of Teachers College, has said that the children who are being called culturally deprived and culturally disadvantaged are really being stigmatized as "uneducable."

Our criticism of the concept of the culturally deprived child, and our criticism of the compensatory education programs based on this concept, can be simply stated. It holds responsible for the underachievement of poor children and black children everything but the schools themselves. Everything in the environment of poor, black children is held accountable: the children came from broken families; they have no father at home; they have too many fathers at home; they are not encouraged to learn; they are not exposed to cultural activities; they don't have a place to study; there are no books at home. In short, everything is held accountable for the child's failure except the schools.

We contend that if the normal child (excluding the child who is so brain-damaged or emotionally disturbed that he should be receiving special services) is not achieving at grade level, it is not the child's failure, but the school's failure.

We are not denying that children from poor families, black or white, need more. We are saying that the children who do need more should receive more, instead of receiving less in schools that are not only racially segregated but inadequate and inferior in every way.

We are urging that Title I programs of ESEA be basically revised, eliminating the ineffective "compensatory" programs and the "extra" services, focusing instead on programs to change the regular school program. We are also urging that Title I programs be directed to two vital areas. First, reading and remedial reading programs; and, second, programs to change the attitudes and to raise the expectations of teachers and administrators.

Negro parents are not simply concerned with the visible aspects of schools such as overcrowded classes or inadequate facilities. The deepest concerns are the intangibles--the attitudes and low expectation of classroom teachers that directly affect pupil learning and achievement. There are too many classroom teachers and school administrators who simply do not believe that black children, and black children who are poor, are capable of learning.

We are urging a massive program of federal and state financial support; but not for the same programs now in effect. As a matter of fact, we would reject new funds being used for the old programs that have proven so ineffective. However, massive financial support is essential for the development of new programs and new approaches intended to change fundamentally the school experience of disadvantaged Negro children.

An increasingly critical and controversial area concerns the participation of parents in decision-making which affects the education of their children. The demands of some Negro parents for "black schools for black children," and the demand for decentralization (not simply changing the structural organization of a school system but changing the decision-making authority within the school system), reflect the hopelessness, despair, and disbelief that the schools as they exist now have the ability--or the intent--to educate Negro children.

The NAACP supports the principle of school decentralization, particularly for the schools of the nation's twenty largest public school systems. I am personally convinced that decision-making by parents is the only hope, now, of assuring teacher-administrator accountability for pupil achievement.

School decentralization, however, must include clearly defined city-wide educational standards; clearly stated criteria and procedures for the selection and placement of teachers throughout the school system; and clearly defined procedures for evaluating school-district performance.

Decentralization plans must also facilitate and encourage school desegregation. I don't believe that there is an inherent conflict between decentralization and greater desegregation. In New York City, for example, I believe it is possible as well as necessary, even at this late date, for decentralization to include the greatest possible desegregation as an essential and immediate objective.

Decentralization plans, too, must include clear procedures for protecting the same rights teachers now have under the law. The NAACP fully expects to support these rights at the same time that we insist upon teacher-administration accountability for pupil performance and achievement.

The white racism cited by the Kerner Commission is reflected at its worst in the curricula, classroom books, and libraries of public schools. Negro parents everywhere are calling on school officials to replace the all-white illustrated textbooks that pretend we live in an all-white community or nation with multi-racial textbooks showing black, brown, and white faces. The NAACP has published a descriptive bibliography of 399 multi-racial textbooks in all subject areas for elementary school children. We are also calling on school officials to revise the curricula to include, fully and objectively, the Negro in American history and American life; and to develop new courses on black history for all students.

One Superintendent of Schools said to me very recently that what was needed was more time. There is no time left. What is needed is not more time but the commitment and the courage to change. The alternative to change is even greater conflict in the future than we have had in the past.

Judge Hoffman, in his recent decision said, "the future of the United States depends in no small part on education; not the education of white children, but of all children. We do not need another fact-finding commission to tell us that something must be done to prevent a school situation which produces apathy and hopelessness; that can cause a life to be wasted; or which produces frustration and anger that can cause a life to be risked in public disorders. It is not rational to maintain a situation which is conducive to the kind of behavior that we must prevent; or to expect schools to produce law-abiding citizens in a school system that flouts the law. School boards and school administrators have a moral and civic duty as well as a legal duty to end segregation. To fail the Negro child would be to fail the nation."

Professor E. Edmund Reutter of Teachers College, a noted authority in the field of school law, examines the developing attitudes of the courts relative to various legislative and executive approaches to _de facto_ segregation. He is scrupulously careful to avoid any interjection of personal opinion, so that the reader is afforded access to the nub of the reasoning of the courts without any attempt to utilize that reasoning to support a particular view regarding how the situation should be handled.

THE LAW, RACE, AND SCHOOL DISTRICTING

E. Edmund Reutter, Jr., Professor of Education,
Teachers College, Columbia University

The purpose of this presentation is to analyze the existing situation relative to "*de facto* segregation." No attempt will be made to evaluate the wisdom of the actions which have been reviewed by the courts, or of the reasoning offered by the courts to support their holdings. Predictions as to the future course of the law will also be avoided. The single goal is to synthesize the current status of the law--what the law *is*. What the law *should* be, or what it *may* become in the future will not be treated.

"*De facto* segregation" is a term which has only recently entered the vocabulary of America. It has, however, in a relatively few years become generally accepted as referring, in the public-school context, to a situation where the students in a school building are overwhelmingly Negro; and where this situation came about through no governmental requirement or encouragement. The term is used in contrast to "*de jure* segregation", which describes the pattern of racial separation which prevailed uniformly, prior to 1954, in seventeen states and the District of Columbia; and in four other states on a local option basis. In these jurisdictions, state constitutions and/or statutes expressly provided that Negro students be placed in schools different from those housing white students. When the United States Supreme Court in 1954 "conclude[d] that in the field of public education the doctrine of 'separate but equal' has no place . . . , [and that] separate educational facilities are inherently unequal," the court ruled out _de jure_ segregation forever, and the country was subsequently faced with two types of _de facto_ segregation.

Various schemes used in the South to "desegregate" the formerly _de jure_ segregated schools have created a type of _de facto_ segregation which is completely different legally from that outside of the South. As of this moment, entirely different bodies of law relate to the problems of school districts in the South regarding mixing the races, and to school districts outside of the formerly _de jure_ segregated states.

The current law for formerly _de jure_ jurisdictions is that it is necessary to completely break down all aspects of the old dual system--both as to actual mixing of races and as to community assumptions that a school is "Negro" or "white"--before there can be a constitutionally equal opportunity to obtain an education regardless of race. This summarizes the "affirmative duty" obligation of school authorities for the "de-_de jure_" type of "_de facto_" segregation--which is not the focus of this paper.

As of the present there stands only one direct judicial holding that school districts have an affirmative duty to correct racial imbalances not of government's making. [Some dicta to this effect were offered by the Supreme Court of California in 1963, but implications have not been subsequently clarified. Also a District of Columbia federal district court opinion in 1967 touched on the point as part of a complicated case.] That one ruling came from a federal district judge whose 1964 decision was not appealed. On the other hand, over the period of the last five years the courts of appeals of four federal circuits have expressly not found an affirmative duty for school boards to reduce _de facto_ segregation _per se_. As recently as the 1967-8 Term, the Supreme Court of the United States has declined to review such holdings.

It is important to recall that when the Supreme Court struck down _de jure_ segregation in public schools in 1954, the intent was that any governmental action which had separated the races would have to be corrected--or, at least, cease to be enforced. Thus, any action by a school board to gerrymander school attendance lines, or to follow different policies for transfers of white students, would be a basis for corrective action. The key legal case along these lines came from New Rochelle, New York. This was a long-drawn-out situation, extending over a period of many years. The court proceedings, which came as a climax to the community controversy, also were quite complicated and extended. The break came in the decision of Federal Judge Kaufmann, in January of 1961, when he found that the board of education in New Rochelle had realigned certain school district boundaries in the past; and had, before 1949, permitted transfers of white pupils--but not of Negro ones--living within the area of the school under controversy. This school was 93% Negro.

Based on this finding of fact (and strongly reprimanding school authorities) Judge Kaufman followed the procedure of the United States Supreme Court in _Brown_ and ordered the school board to present to the court a plan for desegregation of the school. Aspects of the case were eventually appealed to the door of the Supreme Court, which declined to review.

Actually, of course, the New Rochelle case was one of surreptitious _de jure_ segregation. The situation was not solely the result of a neighborhood school plan and housing patterns. I must emphasize the finding of the facts of gerrymandering and discriminatory transfers.

As noted previously, courts of appeals in four federal circuits have held to the view that if a neighborhood school policy is utilized throughout a school system; if the boundaries are drawn on the same criteria throughout the district; if transfer policies are non-discriminatory in nature; and if transfers are non-discriminatorily administered; then there is no further duty upon a board of education under the common law, or under the federal Constitution, to provide an education whereby Negro and white children can mingle in appropriate numbers.

The first case so to hold in a federal appellate court was from Gary, Indiana, in 1963. There the district court and the court of appeals examined in detail the factors which the school board had used in establishing school boundary lines--factors such as density of population, distances traveled, and safety. The district judge held that the law did not require "a school system developed on the neighborhood school plan, honestly and conscientiously constructed with no intention or purpose to segregate the races, . . . [to] be destroyed or abandoned because the resulting effect is to have a racial imbalance in certain schools where the District is populated almost entirely by Negroes or whites . . . ."

Shortly after the Gary decision, the Court of Appeals of New York enunciated for the first time through the voice of a court of last resort within a state the legal principle that a local school board has an implied power to correct racial imbalance if it so desires. The court took pains to point out that it was not answering the question of whether there was an affirmative constitutional obligation to take action to reduce *de facto* segregation. It emphasized that it was considering the question, "May (not must) the schools correct racial imbalance?" The court's opinion relied heavily on the fact situation, which involved zoning for a new public school where the zoning was found to be not "forced solely by racial considerations." The court posed and answered negatively the question, "Does an otherwise lawful and reasonable districting plan for a newly instituted school become unlawful because it is intended to, and does, result in an enrollment which is one-third Negro, one-third Puerto Rican, and one-third non-Puerto Rican white?" This was the first venture of a high state court into this area, and the court tread lightly in terms of keeping its statements narrow.

Subsequent to this case, the Court of Appeals of New York has extended the law markedly in relation to the elimination of de facto segregation along two lines. Both are based on the fact that the Board of Regents (state board of education) and the State Commissioner of Education have declared, as a matter of educational policy, that integrated education is better than segregated education. A series of cases has been decided on the reasoning that--because this is basically an educational determination--the courts can neither substitute their judgment for that of the educational authorities, nor inquire into the social and psychological bases of that educational judgment. Thus, in one line of cases, New York courts have consistently supported directives of the Commissioner to local districts requiring local boards to correct de facto segregation. The second line of cases in New York involves situations where local districts, to improve their educational systems, have voluntarily tried to work out arrangements not mandated by the state-level authorities. These, too, have uniformly been upheld. Included is a plan whereby some children from one school district were bussed into a neighboring school district (with the tuition being paid by the sending district) in order to effect better racial balance within the city, and to give the white children in the suburban area an opportunity to associate with Negroes.

The Supreme Court of New Jersey has taken the position that school authorities have the duty to provide equal educational opportunities for all, and that when the elimination of racial imbalance will promote such equality, if local school authorities do not act, the State Commissioner can require them to. Purely local initiative by boards of education to correct racial imbalance for educational reasons has been judically supported in several other jurisdictions.

Legislatures of a small number of states have passed statutes either requiring or expressly permitting local boards to do something to correct *de facto* segregation. Two of these state statutes have been contested in the highest courts of the states; and the state courts reached opposite conclusions a few days apart in June of 1967. The Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts unanimously upheld a Massachusetts statute related to correcting racial imbalance; whereas the Supreme Court of Illinois, with two dissents, overturned a not dissimilar Illinois statute.

The Illinois opinion, however, was not filed. In January of 1968 the Supreme Court of the United States dismissed an appeal from the Massachusetts decision, thereby weakening part of the reasoning of the Illinois majority--that any racial classification was barred by the Fourteenth Amendment. (Other problems with the statute related to matters not germane to this paper.) After rehearing, on May 29, 1968, the Supreme Court of Illinois by a 4 to 3 vote upheld the statute as within the power of the legislature. The Illinois statute said in part, "As soon as practicable, and from time to time thereafter, the [local school] board shall change or revise existing [attendance] units or create new units in a manner which will take into consideration the prevention of segregation and the elimination of separation of children in public schools because of color, race or nationality."

The Massachusetts statute required local school boards to submit statistics annually, showing the percentage of non-white pupils in all public schools, and in each school of the district. Further, whenever racial imbalance existed in a public school, the local school board would have to prepare a plan to eliminate the imbalance. The term racial imbalance was defined as "a ratio between non-white and other students in public schools which is sharply out of balance with the racial composition of the society in which non-white children study, serve, and work. For the purpose of this section, racial imbalance shall be deemed to exist when the per cent of non-white students in any public school is in excess of fifty per cent of the total number of students in such school." Said the Massachusetts court in sustaining the act, "It would be the height or irony if the racial imbalance act, enacted as it was with the laudable purpose of achieving equal educational opportunities, should, by prescribing school pupil allocations based on race, founder on unsuspected shoals in the Fourteenth Amendment."

It was noted earlier that there was one standing federal district court holding which came close to declaring _de facto_ segregation _per se_ unconstitutional. In this case, decided in 1964, the Board of Education of Manhasset--an affluent New York suburb--was sued by several Negro minors claiming that they and the members of their class were discriminated against by being racially segregated from other children in the public schools of the district. The facts were that 100% of the Negro elementary school children were contained in one school separate and apart from 99.2% of the white elementary school children. Further, the number of children in the "Negro" school was only 166, whereas the other two elementary schools contained 600 and 574 students, respectively. The school district had continued a long-standing, rigid, neighborhood school policy; and there was no proof that there had been any abuse of the companion policy not to permit transfers under any circumstances. The judge found that "on the facts of this case, the separation of the Negro elementary school children is segregation. It is segregation by law--the law of the School Board. In the light of the existing facts, the continuance of the defendant Board's impenetrable attendance lines amounts to nothing less than state imposed segregation." The court, in buttressing its decision further, found that the plaintiffs were injured by the segregation. The court noted marked differentiations in socio-economic levels and in both achievement and intelligence quotients between students in the predominantly Negro school and students in the all-white schools. Regrettably from a clinical legal point of view, but happily for the Negro plaintiffs, the school board decided not to appeal this decision. It abolished the Negro school and reassigned the Negro pupils.

In another case, a federal district court in Springfield, Massachusetts, in dealing with a complicated fact situation stated in its opinion, "There must be no segregated schools." On appeal, the Court of Appeals for the First Circuit expressly struck out this statement. By the time of the appeal, however, the politics of the matter had become complex. The Court of Appeals found that the school board was making efforts to correct imbalances and that if it were able to complete what it had started, the courts would not be called upon to resolve "what is, at best, a doubtful question of constitutional law."

In a widely publicized 1967 Washington, D. C., case, Circuit Judge Wright, sitting as a trial judge, ordered extensive changes related to race in the school system. He was careful, however, not to rule out per se bona fide de facto segregation. In his words, "The basic question presented is whether the defendants, the Superintendent of Schools and the members of the Board of Education, in the operation of the public school system here, unconstitutionally deprive the District's Negro and poor public school children of their right to equal educational opportunity with the District's white and more affluent public school children." His answer was affirmative. It is exceedingly important to note the linking of a socio-economic factor with the race factor in this case. The court examined in great detail (135 pages) factual points related to expenditures, facilities, and teachers. He found a zoning pattern and teacher segregation to be de jure segregation and therefore unconstitutional. He found many inequalities which were not rationally explainable in his view. He found that the "track" system of ability grouping, which had brought the defendant superintendent of schools to national fame, stigmatized early in their lives--inappropriate aptitude testing procedures--children in the lower socio-economic group, which group happened to be predominately Negro. He concluded that "even in concept the track system is undemocratic and discriminatory . . . . Any system of ability grouping [even if the tests used were more valid] which, through failure to include and implement the concept of compensatory education for the disadvantaged child or otherwise, fails in fact to bring the great majority of children into the mainstream of public education denies the children excluded equal educational opportunity and thus encounters the constitutional bar." The board of education declined to appeal the decision and refused to allow the superintendent to appeal. He then resigned, and is appealing on his own, as is one member of the board. He is supported by the American Association of School Administrators in his view that the court went too far into educational policy matters in its far-reaching decree as to remedies; and is opposed in his view by the National Education Association. (The intriguing relationship to the case of the AASA and the NEA is not relevant to the law of _de facto_ segregation, so will not be dealt with here.)

Another emerging aspect of the area of _de facto_ segregation relates to teacher assignment--assigning Negro teachers to predominantly Negro schools and white teachers to predominantly white schools. In the South, where this had been the official practice under _de jure_ segregated systems, the courts since 1965 have been requiring that steps be taken to desegregate the faculties as well as the students. However, as indicated earlier, the law for the South is different than for the North due to the legal necessity of breaking down the former dual school system. The question of forced assignments of already employed white teachers to _de facto_ segregated schools has precipitated much controversy in professional and political circles. The first case to reach a high court dealing directly with this matter was that decided by the Supreme Court of Kansas in July, 1967. The issue was somewhat narrow. It was the question of whether the Board of Education of Kansas City could be compelled to transfer teachers on a basis of race in order that the faculties be better integrated. The Board of Education, supported by the Kansas City Teachers' Association, declined to make such involuntary transfers. The Supreme Court of Kansas sustained the school board's posture. A general anti-discrimination statute in Kansas was found not to apply except regarding hiring, and there the board was proceeding legally in filling vacancies without regard to race. It is important to emphasize that this was not a case of the school board's desiring to move the teachers on the basis of race to get a better balance, but was a case of the school board's unwillingness to act. The question was whether it could be compelled to act; not whether it could be stopped if it proposed to act. The latter question has not, as of this date, been adjudicated.

A final case from Pennsylvania treats many of the preceding points, plus that of the possible authority of special administrative agencies charged with responsibilities related to race relations. Last fall the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania found that the Pennsylvania Human Relations Commission did have the authority to order a school district to reduce _de facto_ segregation even though the neighborhood school pattern would be affected. The court held that for the Commission to invoke its authority it was not necessary to find that the school district had intentionally fostered and maintained segregation, only necessary to find there was in fact an imbalance. The court added the observation that a "neighborhood school, which encompasses a homogeneous racial and socio-economic grouping, as is true today, is the very antithesis of the common school heritage." (The Commission's order for correction of specific acts of discrimination by authorities of the Chester School District had been sustained throughout the three levels of court review. These were: sending only Negro teachers and clerks to all-Negro schools; failing to make kindergartens available in sufficient number to accommodate Negro children living in Chester; and permitting the physical conditions of all-Negro school buildings to be inferior to that of other school buildings in the system.) The key questions for the highest court in Pennsylvania were whether a general order regarding de facto segregation could be issued by the Commission, and "whether the record supports the Commission's finding that the neighborhood school system as applied in Chester violates the Pennsylvania Human Relations Act." The court answered both questions affirmatively.

It is necessary to reemphasize that the foregoing presentation has been an effort to describe the law as it now stands. I have avoided predictions as to what it will be, and preachments as to what it should be. I have eschewed any bending of judicial decisions to fit sociological, political or moral argumentation. My assignment was to be an analyst, not a prophet or an advocate.

The Urban Coalition, headed nationally by John Gardner, is a new organization with great potential and myriad implications for educational policy-makers in the nation's problem-plagued cities. Professor James A. Kelly of Teachers College, who also serves as an Executive Associate on the national staff of the Urban Coalition, discusses the modus operandi and underlying rationale of a fledgling organization that could well play a pivotal role in the amelioration of critical educational problems in the nation's crisis-laden cities.

THE URBAN COALITION:
ITS IMPLICATIONS FOR SCHOOL SYSTEMS

James A. Kelly, Assistant Professor of Education,
Teachers College, Columbia University
and Executive Associate, The Urban Coalition

The Urban Coalition was originally the idea of the late Stephen Currier, founder of Urban America and one of America's distinguished--if little known--philanthropists. In 1967, Urban America joined with city mayors, and leaders from private sectors, to discuss ways in which important elements of the country could be drawn more actively into work on urban problems. The discussion particularly was aimed at attracting major business interests toward involvement in solution of urban problems. The Coalition was conceived of and outlined on paper prior to the outbreak of the Newark and Detroit riots of 1967, but it took public form shortly after those riots. Thus, the genesis of the organization was not originally anti-riot, as it has been interpreted occasionally because of the coincidence of timing.

In July and August of 1967, a twelve-hundred-person Convocation was held in Washington, drawing together representatives of five major segments of American society, and articulate on-lookers as well. The meeting included representatives of business, labor, civil rights, churches, municipal government, and militant community groups. Out of that convocation came the creation of the Urban Coalition and a Statement of Principles, Goals and Commitments summoning the participants and the nation to action. The statement outlines specific policies which the Urban Coalition supports in education: pre-school education; elementary and secondary education; compensatory education; coping with adult illiteracy; work-study programs; on-the-job training; increased economic opportunities for college attendance; and so on.

The Urban Coalition is governed by a 38-man Steering Committee made up of representatives of five sectors: business, labor, civil rights, religion, and municipal government. Leaders of the business community include Henry Ford II; David Rockefeller; Roy Ash, President of Litton Industries; and Gerald Phillippe, Chairman of the Board of General Electric. George Meany, Walter Reuther, and others represent labor leadership. Civil rights leadership on the Steering Committee includes Roy Wilkins, Whitney M. Young and A. Philip Randolph (who is co-chairman of the Committee). Arthur Flemming, President of the National Council of Churches and former Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, is one of the representatives of church leadership on the Committee. City mayors--among them John

Lindsay of New York, Ivan Allen of Atlanta, and Richard Daley of Chicago--make up the fifth segment of the Coalition's Steering Committee.

In March of this year, John Gardner became Chairman of the Urban Coalition after his resignation as Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare. At that time the Coalition had a staff of only three men in Washington. Mr. Gardner has expanded the staff considerably and is personally committed to advancing the cause for which the Coalition was created.

The Coalition's Steering Committee has created several task forces of prominent people in various fields. For example, the Task Force on Educational Disparities, following the Coalition principle of sector representation, is co-chaired by Roy Wilkins, Executive Director, NAACP; Roy Ash, President of Litton Industries; and Arthur Flemming, President of the National Council of Churches and former Secretary of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. This task force--which includes city-school superintendents as well as college and university presidents--meets periodically and advises the Coalition on educational policy problems.

The Urban Coalition is not a donor, gathering more and more money to give away. Its limited funding--all of it from non-governmental sources--is restricted primarily to the operating expenses of the national office. It does not operate programs, and it seeks no "turf". The Coalition, I emphasize, is not a Federal agency. It has no Federal money. Funding is obtained from foundations, corporations, unions, and church groups.

At the national level, activities are concentrated in four major areas. The first of these is support of legislation: a corporation has been created (separate from the Coalition for tax purposes) to advocate legislation. For instance, during 1968 this corporation supported two fiscal positions relevant to education: the need for a tax increase of at least ten percent; and the fight to avoid budget reductions in the field of education and in several other fields dealing with social and urban problems.

The Urban Coalition will not have the often-caricatured, behind-the-scenes, politician-type of lobbyist working in Washington. Primarily, action will consist of the efforts of the principals on the Steering Committee and the organizations which they represent; influence will be exerted through the persons who have assumed leadership positions in local coalitions, who will contact their local congressmen and legislators.

The second area of activity is communications. The Advertising Council is about to begin a major campaign which has been described as the largest and most intensive effort of its kind since the World War II bond campaigns. It focuses on two themes: "If you think there is nothing _you_ can do about the urban crisis, think again"; and the program adopted by the New York Urban Coalition and a number of other local coalitions: "Give money, give jobs, give a damn".

The third major area of activity lies in helping communities to form, organize and operate effective local coalitions. We believe very strongly that the Urban Coalition must be active at the local level. We do not intend to hand out a series of canned programs from the national level to the local, nor will we require local coalitions to adopt specific programs, although we do agree on general goals. We have a staff available to local communities for discussions and meetings, so that each local coalition need not relive all of the problems of raising money and getting the first staff on board. The national staff will also communicate to local coalitions the broad framework of policy contained in the Statement of Principles to which we expect they will be committed.

The Coalition is not designed to develop centrally planned solutions, which--once created--will be placed behind a facade of community participation and uniform community agreement. Local coalitions must allow all segments of the community itself to participate in the process of identifying problems, setting priorities and selecting programs of action.

The national staff also has a very important role to play in helping local coalitions become broadly representative of the communities in which they are located. This means that not only the five segments of American life mentioned at the national level are involved in most local coalitions, but also the professions, academic institutions and minority group leaders, both moderate and militant.

At the present time, about thirty-three cities have functioning local coalitions. These cities range in size from New York City to Winston-Salem, North Carolina. Each local coalition is autonomous, programatically and fiscally.

The fourth area of the Urban Coalition's activity is maintaining a staff to develop programs in the fields of housing, entrepreneurship, employment, education, etc., in order to make these available to local coalitions; and to suggest activities, means of communication, and legislation which are likely to be useful in solving urban problems.

The relationship between local coalitions and superintendents of city school districts deserves comment here. Some of the early local Urban Coalitions did not have superintendents of schools on their Steering Committees; neither the Steering Committee--the combined leadership of the community's private sectors--nor the school superintendents appeared to be disturbed by this arrangement. School superintendents must realize that an important new linkage among community leaders is represented in local coalitions, and that these coalitions will be active in considering educational problems as well as other urban problems. Superintendents should view the local coalition as a new opportunity to build working relations with top echelons of community leadership which are not normally involved in school affairs.

This indeed may represent a departure from the stereotyped view of traditional school "politics". In the past, public support has been sought only at tax and bond elections, and then only to ratify a previously made decision. The coalition idea suggests another view of school politics--one which asserts, "We want to be part of the top leadership group in this community; and we want the support and the criticism of this broader coalition."

In this spirit, urban coalitions seek the participation of public school officials in America's cities. The coalition movement is a plausible strategy for saving our fragmented cities; but in order to work it must enlist the active involvement of all of the leaders of each community.

New York State's Commissioner of Education, Dr. James E. Allen, in his presentation to the Institute, reports on a controversial "trial balloon" recently advanced by former Harvard University President James B. Conant. Commissioner Allen enumerates advantages that would accrue if all locally levied school taxes were eliminated. This proposal, that the state assume the responsibility for financing education, has already elicited, as Dr. Allen predicted, "a high mark on the educational seismograph." In this view local financing of the elementary and secondary schools erects "serious barriers" to the solution of high priority urban problems like integration and decentralization.

EDUCATIONAL PRIORITIES AND THE HANDICAP OF LOCAL FINANCING

James E. Allen, Jr.
New York State Commissioner of Education

Although it is really the state of events which determines priorities for education in these times, each state of the nation will determine--in the way it sets its priorities in the search for solutions--whether and how these solutions will be found. This responsibility of the state is unarguable and inescapable.

The process of setting priorities calls for both long and short-term perspectives, thorough knowledge of each problem area, and of the possible available solutions. There is little point in setting a high priority on a problem where solutions are not in sight, or on one that the passage of time is going to solve.

Setting priorities also requires the willingness to say "not now" to some problems which, though critical, must wait; and the determination to stay with the priority problem through the inevitable disappointments that occur until the solution is clearly in view.

The responsibility for setting priorities is well placed at the state level, for the state has many advantages if it wishes to use them. It can balance off conflicting claims over a wider area than can the local government, and it can better resist the pressures that mount with each local crisis.

It is out of this background that we in the New York State Education Department have placed high priority on the problem of urban education and two of its key elements, integration and decentralization.

But the setting of priorities is, of course, only the first step and, in many ways, the easiest. It can also be an empty exercise of good intent unless there is both the possibility and the determination to move from words to action. Determination alone cannot effect solutions. The possibility of action must be assured by providing those conditions that will recognize the priorities set, and facilitate their attainment.

It is for this reason that I have chosen today to move away from more general discussion of priorities and to deal with a specific idea related to providing more favorable conditions for coping with some of the crucial educational problems of these times.

Recently, at the third annual meeting of the Education Commission of the States in Denver, Colorado, Dr. James B. Conant proposed what he called a "radical new idea" in education: --that public education in the states would be greatly improved if educational decisions at the local level could be completely divorced from considerations of local taxes. He proposed that all authority to levy taxes for schools at the local level be eliminated and that the local share of school financing be transferred to the state.

The objective of such a drastic change in the pattern of school financing, according to Dr. Conant, would be to cut the tie which now binds the two premises of the American public school system, namely: --local control, and local financing. He thus challenges the widely accepted point of view that the tie is essential to the provision of good education.

Dr. Conant admits that the challenge is hardly worth arguing unless tax experts can come up with a way of financing public elementary and secondary education by state money alone (or presumably with a combination of state and federal monies).

Obviously, eliminating the local school district real estate tax would require, in most states, a very substantial increase in state taxes. This might not, however, be as difficult to accomplish as it would seem on first thought. In a few states, the proportion of school support from state revenues presently exceeds 75 per cent (Hawaii - 100%, North Carolina - 72%, Delaware - 85%, Alaska - 88%); in 21 states the proportion exceeds 50 per cent. In 1939-40, the number of states in this latter category was only nine.

The significant feature of the Conant proposal is, of course, the elimination of all locally levied taxes for schools.

While I am not prepared at this time to endorse Dr. Conant's idea of such a drastic shift in the financing of the public schools, I do believe that in view of current educational and financial trends, this is an idea that should receive widespread discussion and serious study by experts in both education and finance.

There is no question in my mind that, despite certain advantages, local financing of the elementary and secondary schools does erect serious barriers, both real and imaginary, to the solution of a number of important educational problems. Let me cite a few examples:

School segregation. One of the most urgent, difficult and complex problems today in public education is the elimination of racially segregated schools. I need not stress that point with this audience, I am sure. In New York State, for example, despite both strong commitment, determination and prodding by the State to reduce racial imbalance--and substantial local action as well--the growth of the problem has outstripped the efforts to deal with it. Racial imbalance within school districts is increasing in both suburban and urban communities; racial census reports show that between 1961 and 1966, in the 41 school districts with the highest percentage of Negro pupils (exclusive of New York City), the number of elementary schools with more than 50 per cent Negro pupils increased from 60 to 72;

the number with more than 90 per cent Negro pupils increased from 25 to 33. Racial isolation among school districts is also increasing. In this same period, the percentage of Negro pupils in one suburban district rose to 82 and in another, to 71. In three other districts, the percentage surpassed 50.

Under present arrangements, this trend is not only likely to continue but to accelerate. Other states are no doubt experiencing the same situation.

A major means of solving this problem would be to redraw school district boundary lines in such a way as to obtain a heterogeneous population from which the public schools enroll their pupils. A city school district, or part of it, which has a predominantly Negro population, could be converted into a district with a more realistic racial balance if the district lines were shifted to include some adjacent district or districts predominantly white.

With existing variations among districts in tax rates, property values per pupil, school debt obligations, and constitutional tax and debt limits, such redrawing of lines is made extremely difficult, if not impossible. If all funds for salaries and other current expense needs and for construction came from the state, the desirable reshaping of school districts for the purpose of achieving integration, and its basic purpose of better education, would be greatly facilitated.

Small high schools. Another condition in many areas of the country which limits the achievement of equality of educational opportunity for hundreds of thousands of pupils is the existence of small high schools. The high schools in half of the school districts in New York State, for example, are too small to offer a good comprehensive education program, operated efficiently and economically. At the same time, huge districts exist which are so removed from community interest and concern that the schools operate almost in a vacuum.

Many small districts could be eliminated and larger ones made more effective by consolidation or reorganization; but these possibilities are impeded because the financing of the schools is in large measure a function of local action.

If the local community were relieved of the requirement of levying local school taxes, the strong educational arguments in favor of district reorganization would be much better received. In other words, the educational system in a state could be much more efficiently and economically organized, with resultant educational gains, if only educational and sociological considerations were involved in drawing district boundaries.

Teacher-school district negotiations. Another gain to be made by shifting local school financing to the state level would be in the rapidly growing area of collective bargaining between school employees and school boards. As long as the bargaining takes place at the local level, involving hundreds of districts, the situation is bound to be uncertain and confused. In many cities, it is complicated by the fact that the power to tax for school needs rests with the city government, not with the board of education. In any case, the local district is not the source of a considerable part of the money involved because state aid enters the picture.

If the state were the only source of money, the bargaining would take place at the state level. This would eliminate the possibility of maneuvering by school boards to hold salaries at a given level as well as by teachers to use a higher level of salary in one district as a kind of whip-saw to effect increases in others. There would be--each year--a greater likelihood of a reasonable and fair settlement of the demands of teachers. Present developments are in the direction of the states' taking a larger share of responsibility. It could be argued, therefore, that the drastic step of relieving the local school board of any responsibility for setting the level of teachers salaries would simply be a hastening of the inevitable.

Fixing salaries on a state-wide basis would provide an additional incentive to teachers to remain in the cities, or in the rural areas, rather than to migrate to the wealthier suburban community for the higher salaries paid there. Inasmuch as the suburbs have other incentives to offer, this would not be expected to be a serious deterrent to the quality of education there. It could be expected to increase the quality in rural areas and in cities. The present movement of teachers in New York State is from rural areas to upstate metropolitan areas; and from both rural areas and upstate metropolitan areas to the New York City metropolitan area.

Other advantages. One can think of many other educational advantages of the proposed plan. Take, for example, the question of providing equality of opportunity among all school districts. It is not easy to be complacent about the present wide variations in provisions which affect the quality of education offered to children within a state. Using New York State once again as an example, expenditure levels vary from $715 to $1058 per pupil when the 10th and 90th percentiles are compared. The extremes are much greater--$470 to $1600.

There are even wider variations in the property values which support a large part of this expenditure--from $10,411 per pupil (10th decile) to $45,000 per pupil (90th decile), a variation of 4.3 to 1. The extremes run from less than $5,000 to more than $200,000.

Likewise, in New York State, there is great variation among districts in the numbers of professional staff provided--ranging from 38.7 to 97.6 at the extremes.

Removing considerations of financing from the local level would make it possible to eliminate these tremendous variations and bring about greater equity and more complete equality of opportunity.

The proposed drastic change in financing would make it possible also to place increased emphasis on careful regional planning for the provision of services which can be best performed at the regional level--as, for example, the provision of special education. It would provide for a coordinated state-wide approach to the provision of education for the handicapped, for vocational students and for other special needs. It would make for the better use of educational technology. Television, computers, team teaching, etc., could be more quickly and efficiently disseminated throughout the state.

Increasing strength of the state unit should enable the states to deal more effectively with the Federal Government in providing for the use of federal funds for special educational needs. There would be less excuse for the Federal Government to interfere in the state-local relationship.

The Issue of Local Control. While any revolutionary plan in education is bound to arouse many fears and concerns, the one being advocated by Dr. Conant will be viewed by many as an earth-shaker, guaranteed to hit a high mark on the educational seismograph. It affects the principle of local control; and this is a principle which ranks as high as motherhood and the flag in terms of protective fervor. This plan will be widely construed as a threat to local control; and there is nothing more certain to arouse instantaneous opposition and to create a position of instinctive, almost implacable negativism. The force of opposition can almost be felt even while merely considering the idea.

Many will state flatly that local control would completely disappear if the state supplied all the funds for the support of the elementary and secondary schools. While there is room for reasonable concern, the validity of such an intransigent statement is open to question.

There are many circumstances and aspects relating to local control as it now operates which would point to the possibility of breaking its tie with local financing, not only without detriment either to the exercise of true local control or the quality of the education being provided, but, indeed, with a strengthening of both.

The value of local control can be measured only in terms of its effectiveness in operation, and in the total educational enterprise of today, there are many limits upon this effectiveness.

As has already been implied, school districts inadequate in size--either in population or geography, or in the nature of the area encompassed, or both--act as a severe limitation on the meaningful exercise of local control. Also severely restrictive are wide variations among districts in the amount of taxable property; and the existence of outmoded tax and debt limits, unequal in their application among districts, particularly in metropolitan areas. Under such conditions, local control becomes merely control of unduly limited opportunities and restricted choices.

Pertinent also is the question of how local is local in terms of today. The separation which once gave to localities their special identity--their peculiar needs and problems--has virtually disappeared with the mobility, the close communication, and the interdependence which now shape the structure of society and characterize our modes of living.

The real meaning of local control is of greatest significance in assessing the effect of breaking the tie between local control and local finance. The true interest of the thoughtful citizen, the concerned parent, is in the quality of education that is provided for the children of their locality. It is to the character and quality of the instruction provided in the schools--the selection and deployment of the administrative and teaching staffs, and the determination of the program required to meet local needs--that local control should be most significantly directed.

As the public school system now operates, however, so much of the energy and time of local boards of education and superintendents must be devoted to financing the budget, negotiating staff salaries, and dealing with bond issues, that there is too little time left for concentration upon this central purpose.

The proposed plan of abolishing local taxation for schools would greatly help to free local school authorities for dealing with education itself; and enable them to make decisions solely on the basis of educational merit.

It is obvious, of course, that total state financing would pose dangers of undue state control, and that safeguards would have to be provided. These safeguards should deal with such essentials as the maintenance and encouragement of local initiative; the stimulation of innovation and experimentation; the continuing opportunity for the so-called "light house" districts and More Effective Schools that demonstrate excellence in operation; and the provision of more accurate measures of educational need so that state financing would recognize special situations such as disproportionately large numbers of disadvantaged children, etc.

In other words, in eliminating certain barriers to educational improvement by cutting the ties between local control and local financing, the utmost care must be exercised to avoid similar barriers that could result if total state financing were to be accompanied by excessive state prescription.

These points I have been making are, of course, only a most superficial examination of the far-reaching effects of so fundamental a change in the pattern of school finance. But this "radical idea" has sufficient merit to warrant thorough study; and I urge a serious exploration of its pros and cons.

There are several ways this could be done. It would be an appropriate study for the Education Commission of the States. I would also encourage the establishment of special commissions by several of the states to examine the wisdom and feasibility of such an approach to school finance.

To examine this idea of Dr. Conant's, and other ideas equally bold, is one of the most urgent aspects of the state's responsibility for education. Facing urban problems--and many others no less serious and pressing--it is no longer possible, in the exercise of responsible leadership, to consider solutions in terms of patching up, reshuffling or superficially modernizing traditional approaches. It is time that we recognize that we are at the end of an era, and that we need to accelerate our imagination and intensify our willingness to devise and to accept really new and radical changes.

The state must, of course, set priorities. But this will be an empty gesture unless appropriate action is taken to remove barriers--and to create those conditions that recognize the priorities set, and allow for their attainment.

Thomas Pettigrew, a Professor of Social Psychology at Harvard University and a well-known researcher in the race relations field, laments the increase in racial segregation in our society. Professor Pettigrew emphasizes research findings which indicate that social class milieu is a more important variable in determining educational achievement than race. He contends that since the Negro middle class, despite its recent rapid expansion, is still so small, only racial integration can provide Negro students with the requisite middle class milieu. Professor Pettigrew articulates serious apprehensions about the Bundy Plan in New York City and other decentralization schemes which do not give racial integration the very high priority it must have. He stresses the need to begin "to start now, start someplace, to integrate"--and advocates the initiation of dispersal plans that would at least begin to break down the massive black ghettos found in the nation's urban centers.

THE CASE FOR SCHOOL INTEGRATION

Thomas Pettigrew,
Associate Professor of Social Psychology,
Harvard University

I am a racial integrationist. I believe that to the extent that we delay or obstruct racial integration, we are endangering the existence of our democratic society. I am more a student of race relations than of education. But I have specialized in the desegregation of schools--and hopefully, their integration--because it is through our schools that the vicious circle described by Gunnar Myrdal can most effectively be broken.

We are far from the ideal of total integration. In fact, our schools are growing more racially segregated, not less. There are more segregated schools in the United States today than there were in 1954 at the time of the Supreme Court decision.

According to Office of Education figures, roughly 18% of the Negro children in the South are now in schools with white children. However, this is an inflated estimate--because 400 Negro children are counted as desegregated when one white child troops into their school. A more realistic criterion is the percentage of Negroes in the predominantly white schools in the South; this brings the estimate closer to nine or ten percent. Progress in the South has been slow and painful since 1954.

But in the West and North we have actually regressed. The situation is worse now than it was at the time of the court ruling. Although the Coleman data are probably the best overall data we have on the standard of segregation in our public schools, they undoubtedly underestimate the degree of segregation, since many of the most segregated systems did not cooperate with the survey: Boston, Cleveland, Columbus, Cincinnati, Chicago, Los Angeles, Houston, Wichita, and others.

Choosing schools that are 90 to 100 percent Negro as an extreme definition of segregation, two-thirds of all Negro students in the first grade are in such schools, and one-half of all Negro students in the twelfth grade are in such schools. As far as we can determine through research, segregation effects are most damaging to both Negro and white children in the early grades; unfortunately, segregation is greatest at that point where it does the most damage.

In most of our systems in the United States a predominantly Negro school is the most reasonable index of segregation. Seven out of eight of all Negro children in the first grade in the United States attend a predominantly Negro school, while two-thirds in the twelfth grade attend a predominantly Negro school. White children are even more segregated than Negro children: four-fifths of the white children in public schools--whether in first grade or twelfth grade--are in schools that are 90 to 100 percent white. So the conclusion of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights in its 1967 report, Racial Isolation in the Public Schools, is more than justified: "Racial isolation in the schools is intense whether the cities are large or small, whether the proportionate Negro enrollment is large or small, whether they are located North or South."

Racial segregation throughout our society is growing, not decreasing. In Southern cities--Atlanta, for example--patterns of resegregation are beginning to look like the Northern style; so segregation might increase in the near future even faster than it has over the last ten years. This might not be so serious if there were no harmful effects.

Doing research to determine the effects of isolation in schools is extremely difficult, since so much of the rest of American life is also isolated by race and class and religion. But to the extent that we can do it--not just in the Coleman data, but in other data employed in the report of the Commission on Civil Rights--it seems definitely true that segregated schools are damaging to both white and Negro children in much the way that a lot of people thought before such evidence was available. As a matter of fact, the data supported earlier hypotheses to a surprising degree. Social data are usually somewhat "dirty," and never come out quite as expected; they are seldom very clear in _any_ direction. These data were beautiful data--they fell in line in much the way expected on the basis of actual observations made in the schools.

Race, as it turns out, is not the primary variable: social class is. The Coleman Report and other researches make this point clear. The Coleman Report shows that while the physical quality of the schools varies, it does not vary nearly as much as had been supposed; and that physical facilities do not have an appreciable effect on the achievement of the children in these schools. Some people have misinterpreted this, almost making it sound as though it were unnecessary to have walls around the school--the wind could come blowing through without affecting the children's achievement. This is not what Coleman is saying. He could only measure what exists now--not what might be done with the aid of new and innovative educational facilities. He did find that the social class of students attending a given school was the chief _school_ variable of a child's achievement score. This parameter can be measured crudely by tabulating the educational level of all of the parents of all of the children in a given school. The higher their educational level, the higher the academic achievement of children of _all_ backgrounds--white and black, rich and poor, urban and rural--is likely to be.

Social class milieu, therefore, turns out to be more important for educational achievement than racial integration.

But only one Negro in four is middle class (whether defined by income, white collar occupation, or high school graduation), while more than 60 percent of white Americans are middle class. The Negro middle class has expanded very rapidly since 1940 when it was only 5 percent of the total Negro population. It has expanded five times, even relative to the growing sizes of Negro-American communities. But in spite of that rapid increase, we need racial desegregation to provide a predominantly middle class milieu, simply because there are not enough middle class Negroes; even if they all went to public schools and lived in the right places, there would not be enough to provide a middle class milieu in the schools.

The Civil Rights Commission Report attempted to go one step further and find out if there were a racial composition effect over and above the very powerful social class effect. We believe there is, but it is by no means as large as the social class effect. We believe that there are important effects for the achievement of Negro children in white classrooms--classrooms not schools, since of course we have segregated classrooms within schools which are often the result of so-called ability grouping. We know about these effects, but we can also show that white children do not suffer in terms of achievement scores as long as they are in the majority.

Even more striking than the achievement effects--true for both children and adults, white and Negro, in the

Commission study--was the effect on racial attitudes and behavior. Here, where the differences are very large, white and Negro children who had been to school with each other prefer interracial friends and prefer interracial schools.

This last point, incidentally, is one of the troubles with the freedom of choice plan in the South and in many places in the North. That is, we have had nothing but segregation of the children for so long that when we leave them the freedom of choice they will choose what they have always had. There are blacks who have known only segregation, and who will therefore tend to continue to choose segregation and separatism. We are now seeing the result of this in the current separatist movement. On the other side of the coin, the whites who have only known homogeneous white schools will continue to prefer and perpetuate that arrangement. This is a route that the Kerner Commission rightly shows we have been traveling for some time, producing not one nation indivisible but two nations divisible by race, separate and unequal. The way to continue on this route is to continue segregated schools, to make them even more segregated. The way to begin to turn a corner is to have more desegregation of schools.

[Notice, I've tried to use the words 'integration' and 'desegregation' differently. Desegregation is the mere mix: it can be good, it can be bad, but it is a prerequisite for integration. Integration refers to the quality of the racial contact. It is not just a mix, but also involves cross-racial acceptance. This is where I think interracial faculties are important--with Negroes as principals and top members of the public school staff. This is important in that the norms which the students are expected to follow are communicated by the leadership of the school system. That's integration.]

One can say: "Well, that's all very nice, but the kids lose what they gain from integrated schools when they go back to their all black or all white neighborhoods, and because they live their lives later in separate situations; thus any good effects achieved in those interracial schools are washed out." That has been a common hypothesis; it is usually stated as fact, although--as with most things in the area of race these days--it is unsupported by any data. So the Civil Rights Commission tested this hypothesis with adults throughout the United States. We could only work in the North and West, because desegregation in the South has been too limited and too recent to show results. We simply asked people what kind of schooling they had had. Then, controlling for social class origins, we compared Negro adults who had known interracial schooling with those who had not, and we compared whites who had known interracial schooling with those who had not.

The two comparisons differ in the same way: those who had known interracial experience as children were very different adults. The early effects did not wash out.

These people had contrasting attitudes toward each other in many ways; but in addition to attitudes, their overt behavior was different. The Negro and white American adults who had known interracial education as children were more likely than the other Negroes and whites to live on an interracial block, and also were more likely to send _their_ children to an interracial school. This is the best endorsement of interracial schooling that one could ask: these people, the products of integration, strive to provide an interracial education for their children--often at some sacrifice, particularly for the Negro parents. But--remember--on the other side of _this_ coin is the finding that Negroes and whites who have not had this experience favor segregated schooling for their children--sometimes, in the case of white Southerners, at considerable financial sacrifice. Given the data already mentioned--that we are seeing _more_ segregation, not less--this can only mean that we are producing yet another generation of white and black bigots: people who will not accept each other when they reach adulthood.

I might also add that Negroes who had known interracial schools are making more money today than Negroes who had not known interracial schools. And, significantly, they are more likely to be working in a white collar job.

It is a human tendency, when one has a problem, to look for the villains; to feel that if these villains were replaced by good men, our problems would go away. If only that were true! Our problems are less the machinations of evil men than the products of outmoded social structures.

If one asks the typical American citizen what is blocking desegregation in our schools, he will mention people like George Wallace, and Mrs. Hicks in Boston. Such people have not helped much, to put it mildly; but they are not the basic cause of our problems. The basic cause is structural: the way we organize our school districts, especially in the main metropolitan areas. There are over 75 school districts in metropolitan Boston and 96 in metropolitan Detroit. These figures are not unusual. There are more than 26,000 school districts in the United States, and not even the richest country in the world can afford that many. We don't have 26,000 good ones, or anything close to that number. To me, this implies that one of the basic needs of many of our urban areas is consolidation, not decentralization, of schools; and particularly it implies the need for metropolitan cooperation before consolidation.

Think of a visitor from some place, preferably a non-Western country, coming in to look at our school system. He is told that there are 26,000 of them, and so--having read books on the efficiency of American management and so forth--he assumes that the schools must reflect this efficiency. So he says: "Well, I've seen cities like Denver where they told me they didn't have problems like this; they have only 17 school districts in metropolitan Denver." All right, what about those 17? He would probably assume that they buy common supplies together, to save money. How many school districts actually buy supplies together? Very few. We lack even the most minimal cooperation.

In other words, we run a very inefficient system, and there are limits to how long we can continue to run schools in this manner. But from the race relations point of view, the way we district our schools guarantees that we will segregate the races, as well as class and religion; the central cities are rapidly becoming more Negro while the suburbs are rapidly becoming more white. Even if there were no segregation within districts at all, there would still be a rather intense pattern of segregation across districts.

Of course, we have segregation within districts as well, and this leads me to the second major cause of segregation in big central cities: the existence of private schools, parochial schools in particular. Again, it is not the work of evil men. As parochial schools have grown in our central cities, they have tended more and more to draw whites from the pool of school-age children, making the public school system more and more Negro, by definition. Only six to seven percent of all Negro-Americans are Roman Catholic, and they are not spread evenly over the Negro population of the United States, (they are concentrated in such cities as Chicago, St. Louis, and New Orleans). This means that de facto parochial systems will tend to be white, and will tend to exacerbate the problem of segregation in the public schools that much more.

The third basic course of segregation in our central cities is the careful misplacement of schools, the zone-drawing, and all the imagination expended for 50 years on how to segregate the schools. This may be called the Hicks-Wallace phenomenon. We are all familiar with it, even if we do not do much about it. But I do not believe it is the most fundamental factor--the other two are.

Looked at from this perspective, decentralization is hardly a technique for integration--not typically, at any rate. To believe that decentralization, as defined by the Bundy Report leads to integration is a pretty dangerous conception. It is clear that Mario Fantini* and others who wrote and sold the Bundy Report do not give integration a very high priority. This is clear from what they write and from what they say publicly and privately. From my perspective, nothing could be more dangerous or erroneous. I should say, too, that decentralization, like Black Power, has almost as many meanings as there are people who use the term. I want to define it in its special New York variety.

New York is unique in its bigness. There are real issues that the Bundy Report defines in New York's way--real issues that they are trying to get to. There is a concept in a particular sociological study of large organizations called "effective organizational span of control," and I am convinced with many of the critics of New York schools, like Kenneth Clark, that the New York school system long ago passed that point. One visit to 110 Livingston Street will clearly demonstrate what ineffective span of control means. New York has clearly reached a point where control cannot effectively be as centralized as it is now. And that is the real issue. Span of control is a function of size. In most American school systems the span of control is not an issue as it is in New York.

---

*Executive Secretary of the panel that prepared the Bundy Report, currently program officer at the Ford Foundation.

Decentralization's second real issue is parental involvement. I want to stress both words: "parental" and "involvement." Parental--not organized leaders who are not parents of the children in the schools. In the three local control school districts in New York City, in the Ford Foundation's abortive experiment, many of the parents have no more say about what's going on than they ever had. But leaders interested in power--though not always interested in education--have a great deal to say. Their influence is not necessarily bad, but I think the real issue is parental involvement more than the political power issue.

Involvement is not synonymous with control. I believe that full control, as its advocates talk about it, is possible only if the local board has control of and full access to the tax base. To the extent that it does not, it does not really have control. I'm afraid that this false sense of control is being perpetrated on some of the parents in some of these areas in and out of New York. It's a kind of fraud; they think they have more control than they really have. We ought to call it something closer to what it is in terms of involvement. Involvement means decision power; it does not mean total control. And I doubt that the American political system is going to allow absolute control and decision making power to a local group when the tax base extends beyond the geographical area in question.*

These are real issues, and they cannot be overlooked or swept under the rug. But they can be effectively faced without some of the damaging consequences that I am sure would flow from the Bundy Report idea of 30 to 60 little districts--homogeneous districts, not only in terms of race, but in terms of class (which would be more damaging than the race, if one accepts the Coleman findings), ethnicity, and religion. In other words, 60 ghettos would be formed, and sealed in structurally; local people would have a vested interest in keeping the structure that way, even if the education remained inferior. I think this would be a regressive step, and regressive steps would only exacerbate the present harm.

If these experiments in local control fail, then, they will fail because they lack direct access to the tax base. (There are also a number of other problems that have not really been faced in these schools.) If they fail, racists will--for the first time in education--be able to blame the deprived for their own deprivation. Teachers, principals, and superintendents will not be blamed; the school board of the whole city will not be blamed. The blame will fall on the people who ostensibly controlled their own destiny.

---

*It should be recalled that this speech was delivered two months before the decentralization issue plunged New York City into a major political crisis.

Floyd McKissick, in his letter to *The New Republic*, used the Coleman Report data on fate control to show that Negroes who had fate control did better--much better--on achievement scores, controlling for other variables; he presented this as an argument for separatism, black schools, black teachers, black control. He omitted one finding of the Coleman Report: fate control is much more likely to be found in Negro children who are in *desegregated* schools, not within allblack schools.

The critical concept to be considered, it seems to me, is the community. We speak of the community--community control, community school board--but how are we going to define *community*? Very little attention has been paid to this in the Bundy Report. I gather from Fantini and others that they have in mind homogeneous communities. They see this as a positive; I see it as a negative--and *that* difference is really what separates us. If one defines community in terms of a heterogeneous area, then decentralization is not in conflict with integration, but, on the contrary, is one way of helping to achieve integration in a large city. Decentralization and integration are not necessarily in conflict; the way they have been presented in New York, they are in conflict.

Dan Dodson of NYU has shown that it is possible to draw district lines in New York City which would aid public school desegregation. He showed that this can be done; but it can be done only if community is defined in heterogeneous terms, and not in homogeneous terms. And this is why I greatly favor the Regents' Plan for decentralization, rather than the Bundy Plan. Up to now we have been loosely defining it in homogeneous terms. We're saying in effect that integration is dead; that it's out of style now--whites do not want it, blacks do not want it. It may indeed be ideologically unfashionable; but the need for integrated schools is even greater than ever. Moreover, public opinion data clearly reveal that the majority of both white and Negro Americans still favor integrated education.

Let's look at the alternatives, not just in education but throughout the whole spectrum of society:

One alternative is to do nothing; to drift, do a little here, a little there; little bribes, particularly in May and June, to see if we can hold off the riots. If we keep doing that, then, when riots occur, we will increasingly rely on repressive force. We will continue to drift toward a police state that no Americans, black or white, can really accept as palatable for their country. We have already seen portents--and not just in the actions of some well-known racist politicians. In New Jersey a liberal governor threw the Bill of Rights into the ocean in his Plainfield search for weapons. If this is the kind of action our better political leaders take when the fear quotient is high, then we had better not drift down that road much longer.

That forces us to do something, but what kind of overall strategy should we adopt? Let me introduce two new, as yet relatively value-free terms: 'enrichment' and 'dispersal'. By varying these two approaches in different patterns, one arrives at four possible strategies. One of these--the 'enrichment alone' strategy--I think Mr. Nixon would support, as well as the Black Power separatists. (I stress separatists, because many Black Power advocates are not separatists at all. Recent polls show that 80 percent of Negro adults still favor integration--that percentage has not declined during the last couple of years.)

The 'enrichment alone' strategy--and I believe that Bundy Plan decentralization is an enrichment alone strategy--is simply to pour money and services into the ghetto. The purpose is to make the ghetto more habitable without spreading it; without dispersing the populace. It is to be made self-contained. Thus, job opportunities are not created in the suburbs but in the ghettos--by building factories there. Public housing is not scattered, but concentrated in the ghetto. This alone makes the strategy a very dangerous one, because--to use Kenneth Clark's word--it threatens to "embalm" the ghetto, to institutionalize it further, to deepen its roots, to build further vested interests for separation. Decentralization, _á la_ Bundy, is a facet of this strategy. Decentralization, _á la_ Regents, would not run this risk if it followed Dodson's guidelines.

The second strategy is _dispersal_ alone, paying no special attention to the ghetto other than attempting to dissolve it. This would have been a difficult strategy even 15 years ago; by now it's clearly too late for dispersal alone. A few quick figures will point this out: From 1950 to 1960 the 212 central cities in metropolitan areas in the United States grew annually by 320,000 Negroes. During that same period there was an annual suburban increase of 60,000 Negroes. From 1960 to 1966 the central city figure has grown from 320,000 to 400,000 Negroes annually, while in suburban areas it is actually decreasing from 60,000 to 33,000 a year. This is the alarming part--we are regressing in residence patterns as well as in schools. Of course, the two trends are tied together. Simply to hold the line--not make the ghettos smaller, but keep Harlem, Bedford-Stuyvesant, Watts, and all the rest from growing larger--would require the annual movement of almost half a million Negroes into the suburbs. This is not likely to happen soon. So the "dispersal alone" strategy has no more chance of succeeding than has "enrichment alone."

That leaves us, then, with some combination of the two. One form would be enrichment primarily, with attempts at some modest dispersal. Some efforts have already been made along these lines. We pass a housing law without effective enforcement procedures. We consider it progress when a suburban block acquires two Negro families. But the overwhelming national effort and expenditure has been going into enrichment programs, such as that in Bedford-Stuyvesant, and into building bigger schools and public housing projects in the geometric center of the ghetto.

The other mix--which I have saved for last because it is the one I strongly advocate--would stress dispersal, even while recognizing that dispersal alone cannot meet all the needs. This does not mean abolishing ghettos; even if they could be dispersed completely. The object is to change the nature of ghettos, not to eliminate them. Look at the difference between North Boston and Boston's Negro ghetto of Roxbury. North Boston is an Italian area: the people who live there do not have to, they live there by choice. Their sons and daughters tend not to live there; they live in suburbia. Therefore, Roxbury cannot be like North Boston; in addition to the Negroes who live in Roxbury because they want to (like Italians in North Boston), there are Negroes who live in Roxbury because they must. As long as Negroes are forced to live in the ghetto, it is not an ethnic area of choice like North Boston but a racial ghetto. It is a prison. Changing the prison quality of ghettos is what we have to do.

We know how to disperse the ghettos. It is not lack of know-how that holds us back--it is a lack of political determination, plus hostility toward open housing on the part of many white citizens. Nevertheless, we could make real strides by combining the dispersal techniques already at our command with enrichment of the ghetto.

What kind of enrichment? Not all types. The criterion I favor is to check always to see if it is productive or counter-productive for later dispersal.

Dispersal, by the way, need not mean salt and pepper. It can mean mini-ghettos. Three out of four Negroes who live in the suburbs live in ghettos--but they are small ghettos. They are better to live in than Harlem, or Bedford-Stuyvesant, because their public services can be integrated--their schools can be integrated, and their facilities are much superior to big ghettos.

Remember, however, that this test for later dispersal must be applied to all enrichment programs. Applied to decentralization, the Bundy Plan does not pass muster while the Regents' Plan potentially could.

This test also applies to new schools. New schools built in the center of the ghetto are counter-productive to dispersal. On the other hand, encouragement of cooperatives and job training in the ghetto should be pushed, because they are productive for dispersal. Other forms of enrichment should be judged by this criterion. I admit that there are marginal cases where the test is difficult to apply, but I urge that each program be undertaken with the ultimate goal in mind.

Again let me stress that I believe an interracial America to be the only viable America. It is not enough to say that separatism is the road to integration--that could prove to be a classic instance of "doublethink," or "wishfulthink." We have to start now, start someplace, to integrate--as the Kerner Report made very clear.

Dean Stephen K. Bailey of the Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs, Syracuse University, foresees increasing pressure by state governments to end racial discrimination and de facto segregation in the public schools. Dean Bailey, while acknowledging "dramatic pockets of improvement," blames the lack of greater progress on prejudice ingrained in the American society and on Congressional recalcitrance. Indeed, Dean Bailey points out that on an "overall national basis we are more segregated today in our schools than we were fourteen years ago. And in recent years black power, white power, teacher union and other forces and factors have become directly involved in the direction and rate of change." Moreover, he adds, the "white noose of suburbia" mocks attempts to solve metropolitan problems within the confines and constraints of innercity jurisdictions. Despite these forces, Dr. Bailey contends that recent legislative and judicial initiatives on the state level seem to be establishing new patterns and generating a "probably inexorable" general movement to mitigate the effects in schools of racial discrimination and de facto segregation.

THE INCREASED ROLE OF FEDERAL AND STATE GOVERNMENTS IN CIVIL RIGHTS ISSUES AFFECTING EDUCATION

Stephen K. Bailey,
Syracuse University

Drug addition is a terrible thing. The extent of its real horror--the enslavement of men's minds and souls--can be gauged by the agony of withdrawal. Anyone who has witnessed an addict in the process of "kicking the habit" knows that man's imagination can conjure few more terrifying hells. The addict goes through such excruciating physical and psychic torment that he would do anything--literally anything--to return to the solace of his powder, his smoke, or his needle.

The people of this nation are collectively in the process of trying to "kick the habit" of 300 years on the drug of prejudice and discrimination. The torment is acute. It is so acute, in fact, that some of us will do almost anything to avoid the "cold turkey" of withdrawal. As regards education, we will pull up long-held family stakes and move to the suburbs where the powder is white and merciful. We will threaten superintendents and school board members and politicans with defeat at the polls--sometimes with bodily harm--if they interrupt our access to the customary sedative. We will threaten our neighbors who try to secure their legal and Constitutional rights. We will spend an uncommon amount of money to send our children to private schools where they can enjoy their racial opiates in peace. We will rationalize the notion of community schools to mean racially segregated schools only, and we will support gerrymandered school districts to enforce this rationalization.

In our moments of sobriety we know that addiction to the drug of racism is both immoral and illegal, and we will approve legislative and judicial pieties on the subject. But when the old craving begins, we will sanction almost any means to see to it that withdrawal is not, in fact, enforced.

This, at least, is my reading of American behavior since the Brown cases of the middle 1950's. And the figures confirm my diagnosis. More children attend schools that are 90% or more of a single race today than was the case in 1954. And this is true across the land: North and South, East and West. It is true in small cities, in large cities, and in metropolitan areas--especially in metropolitan areas. The U.S. Commission on Civil Rights reported last year that school segregation in the nation's metropolitan areas--where two-thirds of both the nation's Negro and white populations live--is more severe than the national figures suggest. And it is growing.

This baleful reality exists in the face of 15 years of Federal action to end racial segregation in our schools; and in the face of the attempts of a growing number of State governments to supplement and even to surpass Federal mandates. Our practices ignore or defy the most penetrating sociological and psychological findings about the disastrous effects of continuing on the path of our traditional addiction.

The symptoms of addiction are all around us: violence, squalor, dependency, ignorance, crime, disease, unemployment, fear, ugliness, hatred, alienation.

What strange perversity--possibly rooted in immemorial animal instincts--drives us to such irrational and suicidal behaviors? Perhaps we shall never know, but, at least, we can make a rational appraisal of what we are constrained by law--and by the Constitution--to attempt. And, perhaps, with this knowledge, we can take new heart in attempting to reverse present trends. Our Constitutional, legislative, and administrative doctors have told us what we must do to be cured. The job ahead is to take them seriously. For, if we do not, the consequences for the body politic are patently disastrous.

Fortunately for the sake of our society, our Federal and State doctors are not letting us rest. They are, in fact, closing in on our evasions, rationalizations, and escapes. This in itself is a cause for ultimate hope.

For purposes of current discussion, the story of the increased role of Federal and State governments in civil rights issues which affect education dates from 1954. This does not mean that Federal and State governments were silent on these issues before that date. The Brown cases had important precursors in the late 1940's and early 1950's--notably the 1947 report of President Truman's Committee on Civil Rights which called for the elimination of segregation and discrimination in schools; and the Texas Law School and the University of Oklahoma cases in 1949 and 1950 clarifying the meaning of educational equality for Negroes in higher education.

The Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka, Kansas was the great watershed. In this case, the "separate but equal" doctrine enunciated by the Court in 1896 in Plessy v. Ferguson was expressly overturned. Resting its decision in part on sociological conjecture, the Court held that "separate educational facilities are inherently unequal," and deny pupil-citizens the equal protection of the laws.

A year later, in a second Brown decision, the Court ruled on the issue of compliance. It recognized the underlying patterns of racial segregation across the nation--especially in the 17 Southern and border States and the District of Columbia, and acknowledged that there would be varying local problems. But it mandated local school boards to proceed towards desegregation "with all deliberate speed," and asked lower Federal courts to require "a prompt and reasonable start toward full compliance."

It would be unduly tedious to trace the judicial decisions of the past 13 years related to the implementation of the Brown doctrine. Scores of District and Circuit Court decisions and dicta have been handed down--some to be overturned, most to be upheld, by the Supreme Court. But the consistent, melancholy theme has been one of attenuation, postponement, and State and local evasion. A decade after the first Brown case, the Supreme Court, in exasperation, noted that there had been "entirely too much deliberation and not enough speed." States and local school districts have experimented with both crude and elegant ruses--all the way from closing schools entirely, to adopting tuition grants and tax credits for whites attending private schools, to constructing various forms of tokenism, to drawing new school district lines with the goal of substituting de facto for de jure segregation. The courts have consistently hounded these evasions, but the process has been maddeningly slow and expensive. Informal social and economic pressures at the community level have too often undercut the enforcement of judicial determinations--even when the latter have been clear and mandatory.

The glacial pace of desegregation by the judiciary inevitably led to militant cries on the part of the aggrieved for more immediate legislative and executive action--especially at the Federal level. Here the great breakthroughs came in the mid-1960's; notably in the Civil

Rights Act of 1964, and in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

What the Brown case was to Constitutional doctrine, the Civil Rights Act of 1964 was to legislative doctrine. Presaged by more modest civil rights legislation, and by the controversial and abortive Powell amendments of the late 1950's and early 1960's, the 1964 Act repaired to the enormous leverage of federal money. In its famous (some would say infamous) Title VI, the Act barred discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal assistance. In essence, the law said, "If you discriminate, you cannot receive Federal funds." This stricture applies, of course, to all Federal assistance, not to educational assistance alone; but its weight has been particularly felt in the schools. And, of course, the 1964 Act had other provisions specifically directed at education.

Title IV, for example, required the U.S. Office of Education to make a survey and report to the Congress within two years on the progress of desegregation of public schools at all levels. This, of course, was the origin of the Coleman Report.

Title IV also authorized the U.S. Office of Education to give technical and financial assistance, if requested, to local public school systems planning or going through the process of desegregation. Not only has Title IV money been used to aid local educational agencies directly, it has supported in whole or in part a number of new units in State departments of education (usually called Inter-group or Intercultural Technical Assistance units) designed to give Title-IV-type services to local school districts. Through grants and contracts, Title IV has also been used to support in colleges and universities a number of special institutes and programs designed to deal with the desegregation problem.

Finally, Title IV authorized the Attorney General, upon legitimate complaint, to file suit for the desegregation of public schools and colleges, although the law made explicit that this provision did not authorize any U.S. officials or courts to issue any order seeking to achieve racial balance in schools by transporting children from one school to another, nor did it enlarge the courts' existing powers to ensure compliance with Constitutional standards. The new powers granted to the Attorney General had the effect of transferring the onus of initiating formal suits from private citizens or private groups like NAACP--plagued with limited resources and fears of local retaliation--to the strong back of the Department of Justice. To date, the Department has been a participant in over 100 cases undertaken as a result of complaints filed under this provision.

The real teeth in the Civil Rights Act of 1964, however, are to be found in Title VI--especially as applied to Federal grants under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. ESEA has provided over a billion dollars a year to local school districts for the target population of the educationally disadvantaged. To qualify, local school districts must file statements of compliance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

This seems to be simple and straight-forward. Alas, it has been neither. What, in fact, constitutes compliance? What practices are in reality prohibited or sanctioned by Title VI?

In order to help States and localities understand their educational responsibilities under Title VI, the U.S. Office of Education, in April 1965, issued a set of guidelines setting forth the kinds of desegregation programs required to satisfy Title VI, and the rates at which they had to be effected.

Three basic alternative procedures were described for establishing eligibility for Federal assistance:

First, school districts with no vestiges of segregation in pupil and faculty assignment or in any other school activities and services could file an Assurance of Compliance.

Second, school districts under court orders could qualify by filing a copy of the final order along with an Initial Compliance Report which would describe the racial breakdown by school-age population, racial distribution of students and staff in the schools, and the procedures and activities utilized to accomplish desegregation.

And, third, school districts could submit Initial Compliance Reports and voluntary desegregation plans for either the establishment of non-racial attendance zones or student free choice of schools, or both. The rate at which desegregation had to be achieved under voluntary desegregation plans was based on a target date of fall 1967 for the desegregation of all grades in the schools. A "good-faith start" towards that goal for newly desegregated systems would normally consist of at least four grades the first year--*i.e.* the year beginning September 1965.

Detailed provisions in the *Guidelines* elaborated on these major procedures, and covered faculty and staff, school services, notice to parents and the public, and transfer and reassignment policies. The *Guidelines* explicitly reserved to the Commissioner flexibility to prescribe alternative procedures in particular situations where necessary.

The *Guidelines* were drawn with both Congressional intent and judicial decisions in mind, but the former was by no means clear, and the latter provided conflicting clues. Inevitably, ambiguities remained. For example, let us assume that families are assured freedom-of-choice in school assignments by a local board. What if no public or school transportation exists to make the choice real? What is "adequate notice" to parents and the public: a squib in the back pages of a local newspaper? a single radio announcement? a personal letter? What if a free-choice program is officially adopted but local bigots so terrorize a child or his family that their "free" choice is to stay put in a segregated school? If an all-white school accepts one Negro teacher, is the faculty thereby desegregated? When does de facto segregation caused by residential patterns become in fact de jure segregation as the result of the redrawing--or the failure to redraw--school district lines?

In the summer of 1965, the U.S. Office of Education was literally swamped with submissions and demands for clarification. The Commissioner was forced to detail personnel from every bureau in the Office to help clear the backlog. And there was an inherently cruel dilemma: funds withheld because of violation of Title VI would be funds withheld from some of the school districts marked by exceptional cultural and educational deprivation and, therefore, in most need of Federal assistance.

The inevitable consequence of these pressures and anomalies was for the Office, understandably, to settle for paper compliance and tokenism. Even so, Earl Warren was soon replaced by the Commissioner of Education as the chief whipping boy of Southern politicians. At least one State legislature called for the impeachment of Commissioner Howe. Some Congressional reaction was equally vehement. Howe was referred to as an "educational commissar," a "commissioner of integration," a "socialist quack." Committee and subcommittee members fenced with HEW and the Office of Education on the question of whether the Guidelines did or did not represent Congressional intent.

And the issues were not confined to the South or to Congressional intent. Even before Harold Howe took over as

Commissioner of Education, Francis Keppel, the preceding Commissioner found himself out of line with a certain kind of Presidential intent. The story is worth telling in brief:

As frequently pointed out by both Southern and liberal critics, enforcement of prohibitions on discrimination was primarily restricted to the South. The problem of _de facto_ segregation in the North remained largely untouched. Compliance submissions, for example, were required only in States that had formerly maintained legally segregated school systems.

But, in the summer of 1965, a militant civil rights organization, the Chicago Coordinating Council of Community Organizations, carried to the U.S. Office of Education its efforts to end _de facto_ segregation in Chicago schools by seeking to cut off ESEA funds under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. The Council's case was well enough documented, and the pending Chicago Title I plan sufficiently questionable, that Keppel sent USOE investigators to that city. In late September, Chicago School Superintendent Benjamin Willis indicated to the U.S. Office that he could not supply requested compliance information for at least several more months. Commissioner Keppel then wrote to Willis that--on the basis of the investigation so far--probable non-compliance with Title VI was indicated, and that the U.S. Office was, therefore, deferring $30 million in ESEA funds until the matter could be satisfactorily settled. Keppel's letter was delivered on Friday, October 1, 1965.

On the following Monday, Mayor Richard Daley, a power in national Democratic politics and a long-time defender of Federal aid to education, was in New York on the occasion of the Papal visit to the United Nations. So was President Johnson. A discussion ensued in which the Mayor set forth in no uncertain terms his strong feelings on the fund delay. The next day, Keppel and top HEW officials were summoned to the White House, and after a meeting with the President (in which it is rumored that Johnson was almost as rough on his staff as Daley had been on him), Under Secretary Wilbur Cohen flew to Chicago to work out an agreement that freed the ESEA funds.

For Keppel, the incident was deeply disturbing, even though Cohen had been able to wring some desegregation commitments out of the Chicago school system. For Title VI policy, the Chicago affair brought an effective end to attempts at Northern enforcement, at least for the following couple of years, since it graphically demonstrated the absence of a legislative mandate for dealing militantly with _de facto_ segregation. Commissioner Howe subsequently stated that racial concentrations in schools resulting from housing patterns and other non-educational manifestations of discrimination, as well as from affirmative school board action in setting assignment patterns, are beyond the reach of Title VI "unless intent can be established." It is true that in June 1967, District Court Judge J. Skelly Wright held _de facto_ segregation in the District of Columbia schools unconstitutional _without_ a finding of intent to discriminate. But it is unclear whether in fact this decision is a harbinger of a predominant new legal position. For the present it stands only as an isolated lower court case.

Although the Office of Education continues to investigate _de facto_ segregation in several Northern cities, the announced policy of the Office is to await a definitive legal decision before attempting enforcement.

As mentioned earlier, however, Title VI is not the only arrow in the Commissioner's quiver. In speeches delivered in profusion across the nation, the Commissioner has suggested alternative measures: programs under Title IV of the Civil Rights Act for teacher training in dealing with problems of integration; State and local efforts through open enrollment; paired schools; the busing of students; and city and suburban exchanges of teachers and pupils. Howe has urged the assignment of more experienced teachers and the utilization of more challenging educational programs in slum schools. He has suggested school construction programs to break up patterns of segregation; and realistic, in-depth curricula on racial problems.

For a number of these approaches Howe has pledged Office of Education support through planning funds, and has called attention to the Kennedy and Powell bills designed to provide additional USOE authority in these areas. He has called _de facto_ segregation "education's most crucial issue," and has taken school administrators to task for their lack of leadership. In one speech he wrote,

> "The load (schoolmen) must carry is that of irritating a fair percentage of our white constituents, of embarrassing some governors and mayors, of alarming some newspaper publishers, and of enraging suburban taxpayers who in proportion to their means are not paying as much for their good schools as paupers in the cities are paying for their bad ones."

This is stiff medicine, and it has been made increasingly bitter to swallow by new Title VI guidelines issued in 1966 and 1968, and by the Green Amendment of 1967 to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act mandating that Title VI guidelines be applied nation-wide, not just to the Southern and border States.

The more recent guidelines have been tougher than the earlier ones. They have clarified many of the ambiguities and closed many of the loopholes in the 1965 version. In addition, the 1968 Guidelines have directly addressed the problem of the quality of ghetto schools in areas where, because of socially enforced residential patterns, desegregation is an all but meaningless term--at least, for the forseeable future. Whether viewed as a practical response to Black-Power militancy, or as a curious reversion to the Plessy v. Ferguson, or as a simple recognition of current social intractabilities, the 1968 Guidelines give special visibility to the central paradox of racial policy in education. The paradox can be put in the form of a question: if you gild the ghetto schools, will you not enthrone Plessy; if you do not gild the ghetto schools, will you not consign millions of minority children to inferior educational opportunity?

What the Office of Education is presently saying is that we must live with the paradox, that we must go with _Brown v. Topeka_ where possible; that we must put teeth into the _Plessy_ notion of _equal_ where separation is a _fait accompli_.

The 1968 _Guidelines_ attempt to provide examples of practices which may cause a denial of equal educational opportunities in schools operating on a _de facto_ segregation basis. Among these practices are: over-crowded classes and activities; assigning less-qualified teachers to schools attended largely by minority children; providing poorer facilities and instructional equipment and supplies at such schools, and higher pupil-teacher ratios or lower per pupil expenditures.

The _Guidelines_ also hold local school districts responsible for planning the location of new schools, and additions to or rehabilitation of existing schools, in a way that does not segregate students on the ground of race, color, or national origin; and for hiring and assigning teachers and other professional staff on a non-racial basis.

Again, the net effect of the newer guidelines is to press harder for effective _de jure_ desegregation and to insist that where separate schools exist because of intractable residential patterns, facilities and programs must be substantially equal within the school district.

This essentially brings us up to date as far as Federal policies are concerned.

State governments have played a lesser role--at least on the positive side. But two types of State activities have emerged in recent years.

First, as mentioned earlier, a number of State education departments have created units to provide technical assistance to local educational agencies in handling intergroup and intercultural relations connected with desegregation efforts. These Title-IV-type activities have been abetted by the decision of the Office of Civil Rights of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to cooperate with State departments, keeping them informed of compliance activities in their States, inviting them to participate in review and negotiation procedures, and encouraging them to make recommendations to school systems as to steps which should be taken to achieve compliance.

Second, a few States--notably New York, California, New Jersey, Massachusetts, and Washington--have pioneered in State legislation, Board of Education rulings, and State Court decisions dealing with desegregation issues. Some have developed racial balance formulas; others have required compliance with desegregation mandates before approval of new construction plans; others have established specific procedures for determining the legitimacy of community decisions affecting racial balance in education.

These State initiatives are probably the beginning of a series of similar developments in other States and regions. As in the case of Federal mandates and inducements, State action creates a Pandora's box of local tensions and conflicts; but patterns are beginning to be set, and the general movement is probably inexorable.

Furthermore, it is patent that State decisions governing decentralization, school-district consolidation, the distribution of State aid, and tax and bonded-indebtedness limitations are all pregnant with implications for the racial composition and practices of school systems.

We must return, however, to where we began, because--in spite of recent Federal and State activity--an irresistible force seems to have met an immovable object.

Actually, this is not entirely fair. The object has not been totally immovable, and some of the lack of accomplishment has been occasioned by Congressional denial of HEW requests for additional compliance staff. Up until the end of the 1966-67 school year, a staff of 37 professionals was responsible for handling enforcement of Title VI requirements in the entire South with its nearly 5,000 school districts. HEW had asked $1.5 million for compliance activities; Congress had granted $770,000. For the 1968 Fiscal Year, Secretary Gardner requested 131 new positions for civil rights enforcement; Congress approved one-half the request.

Despite this terrific overload on the compliance staff, accomplishments have been chalked up. Enforcement has been increasingly tightened. As of January 1966, funds had been terminated for 52 districts. All were cases in which school boards had refused to file desegregation plans or appropriate court orders. No cases were even initiated by the Office of Education against districts that were failing to carry out their desegregation promises. Two years later, however, by January 1968, 75 districts had had funds terminated and 141 others had proceedings pending against them. The large minority of these proceedings were for poor performance under desegregation plans as revealed by site visits of HEW compliance officers.

In terms of achieved desegregation since 1965, the percentage of Southern and border State Negro students enrolled in schools with white students has more than doubled. In the 11 States of the deep South, where only 2% of Negroes went to school with whites in 1964, approximately 18% were enrolled in biracial schools at the beginning of this year.

But, in spite of all of these accomplishments, in spite of dramatic pockets of improvement, the melancholy fact remains that on an overall national basis we are more segregated today in our schools than we were 14 years ago. And in recent years, Black-Power, white-power, teacher-union and other forces and factors have become deeply involved in the direction and rate of change. Many of these forces have run counter to Constitutional principles and legislative and administrative mandates.

The clash continues, and school superintendents are smack in the middle. Charged by law and by edicts of the courts, and induced by grants-in-aid from Federal and State authorities to further desegregation, they are surrounded by community pressures--both black and white--resistant to educational integration. And for those in central cities, the white noose of suburbia mocks attempts to solve metropolitan problems within the confines and constraints of inner-city jurisdictions. The irony, of course, is that the most persistent fear--that the mixing of the races in schools will lower educational standards for middleclass whites--has been thoroughly disproved by empirical social science research.

It is not easy for school officials to combat these pressures, or to rally the community support to enforce changes which they know to be both legal and moral. But, as Emerson wrote, "Great men, great nations, have not been boasters or buffoons, but perceivers of the terror of life, and have manned themselves to face it."

Modern school officials share the obligation--and, in a larger sense, the privilege--of facing up to this terror.

Professor Robert Havighurst of the University of Chicago is somewhat more optimistic about integration prospects than others, as he focuses upon the two salient urban educational issues of social integration and administrative decentralization. He expects that the Black separatist movement, the strength of which in his judgment may be "over-estimated" and is found only in the ghetto where integration is most difficult to achieve, will "fade away very soon." Professor Havighurst predicts that the effective Negro leaders will work in cooperation with white leaders for integration in the schools. The emerging concept of metropolitanism, he contends, will encourage social integration in two ways. The busing of inner-city largely black children to suburban schools, one aspect of metropolitanism, is working "reasonably well" although it affects only a small fraction of inner-city youngsters. The second impact of metropolitanism, Professor Havighurst predicts, will be the growth of open housing "sentiment" in the suburbs, with a still relatively small but steady increase of non-whites taking up residence there. This growth rate will produce according to Professor Havighurst a "marked amount" of integration during the next decade.

METROPOLITANISM AND THE ISSUES OF SOCIAL INTEGRATION AND ADMINISTRATIVE DECENTRALIZATION IN LARGE CITIES

Robert J. Havighurst
The University of Chicago

The two major educational issues in large cities today are those of social integration and administrative decentralization.

By social integration we mean the sharing of experience in school, church, government and occupation by boys and girls, and men and women, from the various racial and economic groups in the population. The purpose of this is to improve the quality of democracy in this country, and to increase the educational achievement of socially disadvantaged children.

By educational decentralization we mean two quite different things. We mean the reduction in size of the administrative district or unit of the big-city school system; and we mean the redistribution of the power to make important decisions and choices about the operation of schools, so as to give parents and citizens authority over their local school. There is no clear connection between the two aspects of decentralization. For instance, an experiment in local community control of schools has been undertaken in three areas of New York City; but this experiment is only distantly related to the proposals for legislative action to divide the New York City school system into a number of separate--and relatively autonomous--school districts, each with some 50 schools.

Local community control of schools means some kind of local school board for a community of no more than 50,000 persons, with no more than 7 or 8 thousand school pupils. For a city of a million, there would be 20 or more local school boards or committees.

On the other hand, administrative decentralization into autonomous districts means the creation of school districts of 300,000 to 500,000 population, each with its own superintendent and school board. A city of a million could have two or three such districts, each the size of Omaha or Syracuse. This would be much too big to serve as a basis for true local community control of the schools. Its goal is to make the educational operations more efficient, more flexible, and less bureaucratic.

The issues of desegregation and decentralization of the public school systems of large cities are both affected by the emerging factor of metropolitanism. This term is a name for the growing significance in American society of the Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area--the area that includes a large city and its suburbs. Most large cities are now the centers of business and industry for metropolitan areas that contain about twice the population of the central cities. That is, a city such as Chicago, or Detroit, or Los Angeles, or Kansas City, has a network of suburbs that are about equal in population to the central city itself. The entire metropolitan area is a cross-section of American urban society, with the various socio-economic and racial groups appearing quantitatively about as they are in the nation as a whole. But the central city has a relatively high proportion of poor people and of Negroes. The suburbs have a relatively high proportion of people with average and above average income and education, and of native-born whites.

Metropolitanism is a name for a way of looking at and thinking about the large cities and their suburbs. The metropolitan areas are seen as units for the purpose of planning the development of the metropolitan complexes of the future. Problems of traffic and transportation, air and water supply, electric power, police protection, and sewage disposal--as well as problems of government and education--are increasingly regarded as metropolitan area problems. Suburbs that were formerly choice residential areas are becoming old and obsolescent, and are given the urban renewal treatment. People of above average means are leaving the older suburbs, to go further out from the central city; or to return to the central city for modern semi-luxury housing and the other attractions of the large city.

School systems in the suburbs are affected by these population movements. More and more, the administrators of suburban school systems are joining the administrators of big city systems in planning for future cooperation.

Metropolitanism is also a name for a new kind of civic morality, which regards the entire metropolitan area as a civic responsibility of the citizens no matter where they live and vote in local elections.

Against this background of metropolitanism, it is useful to look at the problems and issues of social integration and decentralization in the school systems:

Desegregation and Metropolitanism

With the concentration of Negroes in the large cities--and generally in ghettos in these cities--it has become practically impossible to desegregate the elementary schools completely. Nevertheless, important amounts of desegregation can be achieved by school authorities who work intelligently and vigorously at this task. For example, in a big city in which 10 percent of Negro children are in schools containing at least 50 percent white children, it is generally possible to double this to 20 percent of Negro children attending integrated schools. A strong superintendent, backed by a determined school board, can accomplish this by working wisely with local communities at the periphery of the Negro ghetto, so as to stabilize existing integrated schools and to increase the numbers of integrated schools through the "magnet school" idea; and through Princeton Plan pairing or clustering of schools.

It is even possible to use the evanescent "educational park" concept to increase integration in a big city. For example, Superintendent Redmond in Chicago has proposed to construct an educational park with a high school, middle schools and several elementary schools on a large area of urban renewal land near the University of Illinois campus in Chicago. This would become a model school, and would attract large numbers of middle-income white and Negro families to an area that can be rebuilt with middle-income housing--through private housing corporations and a limited amount of federal funds. This is financially feasible; whereas most educational park proposals for large cities have involved prohibitive expenditures, and can hardly be justified due to the existence of fairly modern neighborhood school buildings that could not be put to good use if their students were transferred to an educational park.

Metropolitanism will encourage social integration through the schools in two ways. First, there is the present movement in many areas for middle class suburbs to invite the central city to send disadvantaged children to their schools in limited but substantial numbers. The cost is usually borne by the central city school system, but it could easily become a charge on federal funds aimed at helping big cities solve their problems. This plan of busing inner-city children to suburban schools is working reasonably well. Though it can hardly affect more than a small fraction of inner-city children, it has great symbolic value--as well as value for the children of all social classes who are served by the suburban schools.

Metropolitanism will also encourage social integration by the steady increase of non-whites taking residence in the suburbs; and by the growth of open housing sentiment in the suburbs. The growth rate of the non-white population in the suburbs is greater now than it is in the central cities. That is, the percentage of non-white people living in suburbs is increasing faster than the percentage of non-whites in central cities. The absolute numbers of non-whites residing in suburbs are still relatively small, but the rapid rate of growth will produce a marked amount of integration during the next decade.

The Black Separatist movement is seen by some people to be operating at present against the spread of integration; but its influence is relatively small. Black Separatism is strong only in the ghetto, where integration is most difficult to achieve, and its strength in the ghetto may be over-estimated. My expectation is that the separatist movement will fade away very soon; and that effective Negro leaders will work in cooperation with white leaders for integration in the schools along the lines described.

Decentralization and Metropolitanism

The term decentralization has two widely different meanings as it is applied to school systems in large cities. One meaning is the subdivision of a large district into sub-districts which have a considerable degree of autonomy. The autonomy may consist of a separate Board of Education, a separate Superintendent and a separate legal entity. One proposal for New York City is to create 15 districts each with a superintendent and school board, and each autonomous in most matters.

In practice, the degree of autonomy is likely to be considerably less than that proposed for New York City. For example, Chicago created three associate superintendencies by dividing the district into three regions, and assigning major administrative autonomy to each region under the general superintendent and school board. Detroit created nine district superintendencies, each district having a considerable degree of autonomy under the central administration and school board.

These forms of decentralization illustrate the current effort by practitioners and researchers in the area of large city planning to find the optimal size unit for administration of civic and educational functions. These people generally agree that the unit should have between 200,000 and 500,000 population. A district this size could have all the special school services from preschool to community college. It could share in the financial base of the entire city or metropolitan area; and otherwise be quite separate, except for planning--and for such features as educational television, area theater, symphony and other cultural activities that can better serve the entire metropolitan area.

Ideally, this self-governing unit of the large city should be almost a cross-section of the population of the metropolitan area, with rich and poor people, white and non-white, associating in school, government, business and cultural activities. But the present pattern of economic and racial segregation makes this extremely difficult to attain in most large cities. There is danger of creating school districts and local government districts in which the people are nearly all of one racial or economic group; thus creating barriers to social integration.

Decentralization of this first general type should be undertaken with great caution and flexibility. Generally there are two or three areas of 200,000 to 500,000 in a big city which already have a cross-section of the population. It would seem useful to try out decentralization in such areas; holding the process in abeyance in the rest of the city until urban renewal, city planning, and private and public housing development brings other sections into a condition where they more nearly represent a cross-section of the population.

The opposite of decentralization--consolidation of small units--seems destined to take place in suburban areas, but at a rather slow pace. If the optimal size unit in a metropolitan area is one of 200,000 to 500,000, it may be expected that suburban regional districts will be formed of this size, through voluntary cooperation of local government and school districts. Such cooperation may be fostered by federal government grants under the Department of Housing and Urban Development, as well as under state government policies for suburban development. This process will probably be slow, but the quality of education and government in the suburbs is not likely to improve very much under present conditions; while the central cities will renew themselves and become more attractive places for living as the suburbs grow old and obsolescent.

Let us turn now to the other form of decentralization--the creation of small, local, autonomous school units under the general supervision of the superintendent and school board of a large city. Examples of this are the three experimental situations in New York City. Each one centers around a middle school, and several elementary schools that feed into the middle school. A local School Council is elected in the area; this Council selects an Administrator, who has much more authority over his small district than is available even to a District Superintendent in the regular New York City system. The three areas are all in the inner city, though they differ somewhat in their ethnic and socio-economic composition.

Here, for the first time in large city school systems, the parents and local community leaders have a substantial voice in the operation of the school. The New York City Board of Education has general authority over these local districts, through the central office and district superintendents. But the local School Council has been permitted to choose its own Administrator, outside of the list of principals and those who have passed the principals' examination. The Administrator and his Council have been relatively free to select school principals and to recruit and assign classroom teachers, partly because there were a number of requests for transfer out of these schools by teachers and principals who had been there before the experiment started.

Controversy has surrounded this experiment, and has been well publicised. Whatever happens should teach us important lessons about the possibilities of local self-government in disadvantaged areas of the big city. We may remind ourselves that in a middle-class community, the parents and community leaders exercise a great deal of informal control over their local schools. Through the Parents' Association, and through easy access to the central administration, they can complain about a school principal or teacher and produce changes. They are also likely to be consulted informally on the assignment of a new principal.

The move for local community control in slum areas, and racially segregated areas, is really an attempt by heretofore powerless groups to secure the same degree of control over their local schools as exists in practice for middle income groups.

Strong support is now being given, in various quarters, to the idea of self-determination for the poor and the disadvantaged sections of the population. Out of this will possibly come some sort of system of local community school councils with considerable power to advise the school administration. Probably the actual control of appointment of personnel to the local school, and of the content of the curriculum, will remain in the hands of the administration of the city schools.

The difficulties and the conflicts that have occurred in the New York City experiment make it clear that this is a major problem for our society to solve--perhaps the critical problem in the evolution of America toward a truly integrated democratic society. This is a completely different problem from that of administrative decentralization of New York City into 15 or 30 autonomous districts of 50,000 pupils. Not until we get down to an area of 5,000 to 10,000 pupils can we speak realistically of local community control of the schools.

A rather different solution of the problem of local community control and participation has been worked out in Chicago, in the Woodlawn area, a segregated Negro area just south of the University of Chicago. Here has been created an advisory board to the Chicago School Board, consisting of equal numbers of people named by three parties: The Woodlawn Organization (a local community organization); the Chicago Public Schools; and the University of Chicago. This organization has the advantage of bringing the various interested parties into direct communication for cooperative attack on problems; rather than confrontation in the press and the public view before they have a chance to work out their differences. It remains to be seen whether the local community representatives will be satisfied with this kind of arrangement.

Integration versus Decentralization

It is important to keep in view the basic conflict between decentralization of administration and decision-making power in a big city, and the goal of social integration in a city that is segregated by race and income. In order to increase social integration, there must be a central power working for integration against the segregative tendencies of decentralization. The further we go toward local community control of schools in the present big-city situation, the more difficulty we create for a policy of social integration. In the suburbs, there is too much local community control for the health of the whole metropolitan area.

A truly wise policy that guides educational development in the metropolitan area will seek a viable balance among three forces:

1. The drive for self-determination in matters of education and local government by the poor and the disadvantaged racial minorities.

2. The push for flexibility and innovation in the very large school systems.

3. The ideal of social integration of people of various racial and economic groups.

Adolf A. Berle, an internationally known statesman and Professor Emeritus of Law at Columbia University, discusses from the perspective of his multi-faceted experiences the powers and responsibilities of the contemporary educational administrator. Professor Berle emphasizes his belief that the education of children must not be sacrificed to militant race-relations, anti-war or teacher groups "no matter how meritorious" their demands. He defends the use of police force, if necessary, to keep the schools from becoming battlegrounds and states that the likelihood of "force confrontations" can be diminished if educational officials will take the initiative in establishing a dialogue with parents in their communities. Professor Berle states that the realities of decentralization need reexamination so that dialogue with the constituency may be properly developed.

SOME PERSPECTIVES ON THE POLITICS AND ORGANIZATION OF EDUCATION

Adolf A. Berle, Professor Emeritus of Law,
Columbia University

No apology is needed for considering educational institutions of our time as part of its structure of political institutions. Every Superintendent of Schools has known that for years. All school administrators have positions of power in great institutional hierarchies, which are organized and maintained to educate children. Many of them are faced with pressures, activist movements, and militant groups in their local communities--some of these groups even prepared to use force. In many cases, these movements are only secondarily interested in the teaching of children. Some want to stop the war in Viet Nam; some to change the base of race relations between whites and blacks; some to attack the phenomenon of poverty in a rich country. They move against schools and educational institutions because these are in easy reach, and because they offer possible enclaves of power which leaders of these movements would like to possess. Some activists would like to control schools and school systems as a source of jobs for their adherents; and some because thereby they can disseminate attitudes and ideas helpful to their purpose. These are the grim realities faced by many educational administrators, especially in big cities.

Paralleling these movements is a concern whether the education provided by our school system is as good and effective as it ought to be. This concern is directed, essentially, toward how and what the children are taught. The objectives of education are not questioned, but the accusation is made that in great areas it does not succeed in the task it has set for itself. This concern is legitimate. Real questions do exist, for example, whether our present educational apparatus can adequately educate children in the negro and ghetto areas. There is a good deal of evidence to support the proposition that the job is not being done as well as it should be.

Sharp distinction must be made, however, when dealing with groups who desire to change race relations between white and black; or change the power relations between the poor and the well-to-do or middle classes; or to make other reforms; and who want to take over control of the school system, or parts of it, as a strategic place to begin. The latter are prepared to make the schools a battleground--and the children in them cannon-fodder--for their point of view, even though the children's education is interrupted and obviously suffers in the process. Every school Superintendent in any substantial city knows exactly how this works.

Attempt to develop or improve school instruction--a legitimate and continuing concern of all of us--is frequently used by some other group as a lever to advance its own power position.

One attempt to improve the technique of school administration, and instruction with it, will serve as illustration. This is the movement towards "decentralization" presently popular in some areas, including New York City. This principle appeals to me, as it does to many other people, but its realities need examination.

"Decentralization" has at its base an attempt to reconnect schools with the local "communities" they originally served. Schools in America were developed by and out of small communities, or identifiable community-organized areas in larger cities. The little red schoolhouse and the village schools in rural areas were paralleled more or less by grammar and high schools closely connected with identifiable areas in large cities. I am old enough to have had experience with both. The New Hampshire rural school where I spent some of my childhood was an outgrowth and expression of a small town; was financed by it; was controlled by it; and operated as an integral part of the town's social life. At present it is fashionable to denigrate the quality of those village schools, yet in their time and context they did an excellent job. I also remember the school system in an outlying part--the Alston district--of Boston, Massachusetts. It was included in a great city and a large school system--but the school itself was an integral part of a local section having recognizable structure and identity. There also the community expressed itself through the school, and acknowledged responsibility for education in matters of social customs and discipline as well as academic content. "Decentralization" in today's phrase represents an attempt to recapture that identification of community with schools. Attempt is being made now, in New York City, to decentralize--with just that in mind.

Unfortunately for the experiment, conditions have radically changed. The old "communities" have ceased to exist in some areas. In others, they have wholly changed character. In many places the old "neighborhoods" have vanished; in others, only vestiges of them still remain. Remanding the schools to local "communities" placed on the school authorities, including school principals, the problem of finding the relevant "community"; or, if there was none, of attempting to create one. The problem has proved far harder than anyone suspected. Devices for doing so have been developed: Parent-Teacher Associations, local school community associations, community councils and the like. Unquestionably there are areas in which "communities" still do exist. Perhaps in most areas within which schools operate, there are remains of old neighborhood structures. This may be brought back into being. But it is absurd to pretend that--at least in cities--these have the coherence and consensus of the communities of a generation ago.

Even rural communities no longer live within themselves: their habits of visiting, maintaining friendships, buying and recreation, have been modified by automobiles and may cover an area of fifty miles' radius. Their ideas and thinking no longer center on local churches; they are more likely to revolve around prime time television programs distributed by national media organizations and (in ghastly fact) ultimately dictated by big advertisers. Districts in the midst of big cities are in even greater flux. Their populations shift and change. There is no necessary neighbor-relation between an apartment dweller and the next-door family. In middle class areas a man's job often includes the possibility that he may be transferred to some other city every three or four years; so that community roots, at best, are shallow.

Groups frequently emerge claiming to speak for the "community"--and very often there is no organized community to challenge their claim. The school officials then must endeavor to communicate with the parents of their children, discovering the individuals or organizations representing their true constituency. Otherwise, schools become merely hurricane centers for contending elements. The realities of "decentralization" need reexamination so that dialogue with the constituency may be properly developed.

Another problem thrusting into every school district is that of race relations. More than ten years ago the

Supreme Court directed that schools be desegregated--that they should include both white and black students. Educational doctrine supported this conception. A whole system of law and administration has been built on it. But today powerful black groups, sometimes with a measure of white support, demand almost the exact opposite. Some insist that black children are entitled to an education based on projection of black personality, black history and black culture by black teachers. These conflicting demands are incompatible; no school superintendent can possibly satisfy both. The conflict pushes itself into some areas where "decentralization" is attempted. If the district is predominantly Negro, school principals--they have unwillingly become field commanders in their areas--are faced with demands that they hire only Negro teachers, sometimes accompanied by threat of physical entry into and seizure of the school if the demands are not met. As a result, one school in New York City is presently closed down. The children the school is there to serve go untaught. Groups seeking power are prepared to sacrifice the interest of children in order to get it.

The evidence is enough--and more than enough--to justify the proposition that the task of a school Superintendent is in part political--using that word in its nonpartisan sense. He will need a set of principles to guide his decisions.

There are, I believe, five principles of power.

They apply to the power-position of a school Superintendent or a school principal just as much as to a president, a prince or a governor. They are these:

First: Power moves in to avoid chaos; that is the first function.

Second: Power is always personal--it is always lodged in and exercised by men.

Third: Power always operates through institutions--in this case, school systems--and is usually placed by the institution in the hands of the man or men who administer it.

Fourth: Power is always accompanied by and acts by virtue of a philosophy. In this case, American philosophy calls for education of children, and the school system is there to accomplish that purpose.

Fifth: Power always acts in the presence of a field of responsibility and carries on a dialogue, organized or unorganized, with that field. A school Superintendent has a defined city or area. The people in it who are affected by the school operation are his field of responsibility. Some sort of dialogue, orderly or sometimes disorderly, goes on between the administrator and elements in that field all the time. In extreme cases, the dialogue may be between a principal and an activist group forcibly demanding possession of the school. Less dramatically, it goes on as a running discussion between school administrators and more or less organized groups having or claiming to have interest in the school system.

Applied to the area of a school administrator's power and responsibility, I think it will be found that these five rules fit.

However, application of these laws commonly arises in reverse order. The first problems are likely to come up in the field of the dialogue. When a decision is made, a regulation is put into effect, a policy is changed, something is going to be said or written. Some reaction, favorable or unfavorable, is bound to appear. The first choice is whether to wait for the reaction and reply to it--or whether at outset state the case for the action through the most appropriate medium of communication. That might be through a release to the newspapers, or in a speech to the appropriate association, or through a communication to the local governing power--or possibly all three at once. In routine matters the point may not be important--a simple bulletin sent out to schools and teachers may be sufficient. But in controversial affairs the right decision may be vital. At this point the administrator has his chance to frame the debate--and setting the terms of the debate may well be crucial.

No generalized advice is possible--but my own impression is that the administrative officer is usually more effective if he leads off the discussion, analyzes the guts of the problem and states the exact issues involved. For example, he can make clear that the thing he is doing or about to do is designed to assure that pupils get taught--the senior and controlling objective for which he is appointed. He can separate that issue from the other issues involved--which may be race relations, teachers' pay, pacifist instruction, or whatever. He can point out, for example, that while obviously race relations need to be improved and put on a better basis, no school administrator has either right or mandate to sacrifice the interests of the children while this is being done. By starting the discussion, he can take an affirmative position in favor of his children; asking for the support of the institution he represents, of the public his schools serve, and of the government that appointed him as he endeavors to carry out the precise purpose for which he was given power. This requires any objecting groups to defend what they are doing--which in civilized debate of course they should. Getting the case clearly stated at the outset is half the battle when controversy impends.

Unjustified controversy has been generated about this. It is said, rightly, that police ought not to be in schools; but the moment public order in or out of the schools is challenged, it must be restored. Contention is made that if the school or its personnel require police protection, something is wrong with the school--which does not at all follow. If a mob, strike, or other organization, or a group of juvenile delinquents attempts to make a school into a battleground, the children, as well as the principal and teachers are entitled to protection. The city or district government is responsible for providing it. The certainty that force will be met by greater force is the best deterrent. But it is also true that a well-developed and well-handled dialogue, bringing about a large measure of local support, can diminish the likelihood of force confrontations and discourage challenges to order.

Next, any administrator in power is bound to uphold the integrity of the institution that put him in power. If change or reform is needed, he can say so and possibly initiate it. What he cannot do is surrender control over the institution, or any part of it--except by virtue of an institutional decision.

This is the precise difference between evolution and revolution. I know there is dissent in this field. There are protagonists of revolutionary change as well as of progress. I myself disagree with the doctrine, but--in any case--the option is not open to a powerholder. He can--he may--advocate change in institutional decisions, or change in methods of institutional operation. But it is not for him to alter them; still less to surrender the structure until change has been enacted by lawful authority. Until that has been done, he must execute the mandate he has even if he believes in and advocates its change.

Finally, and of supreme importance, he must maintain and support the philosophy on which his institution is based. His highest duty is determined by that philosophy. If we assume, as I have here, that the philosophy of any school system requires that the children encompassed in it shall be educated, then his loyalty, his decisions and his actions are determined by that fact. He cannot yield to any invasion of it. I am aware this may bring him into conflict with powerful organized force--for example, a teachers' union calling a strike, or a militant group seeking to staff a school. Most such strikes are illegal;

but--legal or not--they do involve sacrificing the welfare of the children's education to some interest other than that of assuring the children's education.

This proposition will be disputed. Groups interested in race relations will say that children are badly educated until these relations are adjusted. Some militant groups insist that until the white man shrives his soul for past historical guilt, no education is sound. Teachers will insist that until their demands are met children can not be well taught. Militant anti-war groups will maintain that until some particular activity they object to is remedied, children's education suffers. Therefore, they contend, they are entitled to interrupt school operations until their demands are satisfied. Conceding good intention, even allowing a measure of truth in their contentions and assuming reforms may be desirable, it nevertheless is unanswerable that during the struggle the children suffer. Indeed, these groups desire that they shall suffer, in order to obtain political or other leverage toward compelling satisfaction to the group's demands.

The dialogue associated with power must make the issues as clear as humanly possible. Schools are there to see that children shall be taught and trained; we all know what happens to untaught and untrained children. Doing that job is exacted by the philosophy that brought school systems into existence. Defending the institution's capacity to do the job is, I concede, the ultimate task and responsibility of its administrators.

Attitudes need not and indeed often should not be rigid. There are few institutions--schools included--which are perfect. Very many changes can be made for their improvement. Many may require greater measure of support, financial and moral, by the city or community served, by its government, and by its taxing authorities. School administrators have the right and the duty to point out what changes and improvements are needed, and to ask that the costs be met. But no administrator can hand over all or any part of his power to anyone else, until authorized to do so by competent action of his community's government.

My field is political and social science, not education, therefore my comments have dealt with the political and social aspects of a school administrator's job. The law of being of an educator--from which he derives the power he holds--requires him to put the education of children first; it demands of him that he protect that trust from advocates of any other interest--no matter how meritorious that interest may be.

James F. Redmond, General Superintendent of the Chicago Public Schools, discusses in a case analysis concurrent efforts to desegregate and to decentralize one of the nation's largest and most difficult city school systems. Dr. Redmond stresses the financial limitations which so cripple efforts to ameliorate the urban school crisis. He does not believe that effective decentralization necessitates multiple boards of education. In his judgment, the central Board of Education "can set policy for the city as a whole" and can be the "watchdog" of those centralized services which lend themselves to efficiency without interfering with the education of a child. Decentralization, however, maintains the Chicago Superintendent, is needed to make large school systems more sensitive to their clientele. School officials in Chicago and elsewhere "must listen more, observe more, comprehend more and understand more."

EFFORTS TO DESEGREGATE AND DECENTRALIZE THE ADMINISTRATION OF A LARGE CITY SCHOOL SYSTEM

James F. Redmond, General Superintendent,
Chicago Public Schools

When I heard of the initial controversy over civil rights between the Chicago Board of Education and the federal government, I was far away in Syosset with problems of my own. Then, in October 1966, I assumed the Superintendency of Chicago schools.

I was faced--immediately--with problems of immediate concern--and a two-month deadline for solving them. Coping with the civil rights issue was forced into the background. First, the budget for 1967 had to be made; second, a legislative program for the forthcoming session had to be submitted to the Illinois School Problems Commission; and third--the most frightening of all--was the need for immediate retrenchment to cover an existing five million dollar deficit in the 1966 budget.

We crawled--or is it creaked or is it stumbled?--through these two months and dragged a three million dollar deficit over into the adopted budget in January of 1967. As if waiting for me to take a deep breath, the Office of Health, Education and Welfare sent a nice, polite but firm letter to me early in the month; reminding me that the civil rights controversy was far from over. I was asked to immediately reply to their queries about desegregation.

The walls of urban problems had crowded in about now and I decided this was one wall I was not going to break through alone. I wrote to Harold Howe and asked for an appointment to bring some members of my staff and discuss a grant to study the areas of desegregation.

By April, the grant was made and some very able consultants were on hand to work with us. The sum was modest for a varied study that required the talents of a number of specialists. Fortunately for us, the consultants were much more interested in the problems to be studied than in the fees that they might earn. I am quite sure that we could not have purchased their services if it were not for the intriguing possibility that some light might be brought to bear on social problems plaguing every urban school system in America.

It was agreed upon in Washington that--in addition to the four areas of interest to the civil rights people--two more should be studied: one was Research and the other Public Understanding. The original items were--Faculty Assignment Patterns, Boundary and Student Assignment Policies, Vocational Education and Apprentice Training.

In August, we took the report to the Board of Education. It was accepted in principle, with the understanding that the implementation of any recommendations would be brought back to the Board of Education in separate reports.

The press, radio and television reaction was favorable--in some cases laudatory. The public reaction was mixed. Civil right advocates were in some cases unhappy that the report had not made more drastic recommendations. Adherents of the neighborhood school policy were sure the report was sounding the death knell on the local school. More was read into the report than was written in it.

Some of the basic recommendations were as follows:

FACULTY ASSIGNMENT PATTERNS

Intensive efforts should be made to recruit, prepare and keep teachers in inner city schools.

Teachers in inner city schools should be provided with guarded parking lots and/or transportation to and from school.

Instructional groups consisting of the following members were recommended as a staffing pattern for each 150 students:

1 Master teacher
3 Regular teachers
1 Beginning teacher
2 Practice teachers
3 Aides

Principals who are likely to be successful in inner city schools should be identified and selected for assignment there.

Teacher aides should be available immediately with or without new organizational patterns.

BOUNDARIES AND STUDENT ASSIGNMENT POLICIES

Integration is desirable for white and Negro children alike.

Every effort should be made to retain the white population and promote stabilization in integrated school situations.

Efforts should be made to provide cooperative programs with the private and parochial schools in the city as well as the suburban schools in the metropolitan area.

Short-term Plans

In fringe area schools (now integrated), the minority percentage should be limited to a workable racial balance. In order to maintain the balance, pupils will be transported to a receiving school in an all-white attendance area not adjacent to the sending school attendance area.

Voluntary transfers will be available from the inner city to less crowded schools in other parts of the city.

Boundary changes should be made to reduce racial segregation and to assist in neighborhood stabilization.

School pairing plans (clustering) should be used in key transition areas to achieve integration and stabilization.

Magnet schools, both specialized and general purpose, should be established, with very broad racially mixed attendance areas.

Long-range Plans

Education parks should be established, combining many kinds of educational programs in one location. Several education parks should be located in a wide variety of places near the outer rim of the city.

School and city governments should work more closely together to effect integration in housing, in schools, and in community development.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

The Apprentice Program

The Washburne Trade School is operated by the Chicago Board of Education. Selection of apprentices is made by the various sponsoring agencies--employers and unions.

Apprenticeship is a work-study process; the apprentice spends 10 to 20 percent of his time in school and the remainder on the job. The sponsor (employer, union, or other) must accept the enrollee. With few exceptions, apprentices are paid full wages.

It is felt that the school should be continued, but that every effort should be made to improve racial balances.

Negro participation can be increased by increasing the number admitted and decreasing the number dropping out of the program.

Open Enrollment in Vocational Schools

Open enrollment should be widely publicized and emphasized.

Active and aggressive recruitment should be citywide. Recruitment should be most active in Grades 10 and 11. Transfer and shared time plans with regular high schools should be expanded and publicized.

Vocational offerings, buildings, and equipment should be attractive and up to date.

Greater variety in programs should be available within the capability of students and the current job opportunities. More summer programs should be offered.

Location of programs should be considered as a means of promoting racial integration. Job placement services should be aided by follow-up of graduates.

PUBLIC UNDERSTANDING

By its nature, a public school system depends for maximum results on understanding and support from the public. Expansion in public relations is essential, especially at this time when potential for improved education involves program and policy changes which cannot succeed without public acceptance.

A system of fast, flexible, internal communication is needed to keep all school personnel fully informed.

A widespread program of public communication should be initiated to generate interest in--and support for--Chicago's schools, keeping the public fully informed.

It is now a year since the report was presented to the Board of Education. The hoped-for funds from state and federal sources have not materialized.

However, this has not kept us from moving ahead where it was possible to do so. We instituted a transportation program to help stabilize an integrated community, and to use some available empty seats in an all white neighborhood. We followed the suggestions in the recommendations and moved past fringe school attendance areas to schools beyond. Distances were not great and all schools--sending and receiving--were under the supervision of one district superintendent.

There were five hundred elementary students involved in the transportation program. The reaction in the white school attendance areas was extremely hostile. The very modest program solidified all the forces throughout the city that were neighborhood-school-minded. So loud and so vocal and so numerous were the voices of opposition to transportation that certain segments of the press and the political society grew alarmed and called for capitulation.

As I mentioned previously, there has not been a time since I arrived in Chicago that we have not been fighting a losing battle to meet our meager budget requirements. During this period, we were before the citizens with a request for a fifteen-cent tax increase which would give us approximately fifteen million dollars.

Out of the white areas of the city came a well-financed, well-organized campaign of opposition. There was nothing subtle about the campaign. It was against transportation. Fear was spread across the city that I was about to have white and Negro children on a continuous bus trip across the city.

Mayor Richard Daley and the Democratic Party, the business community, labor, and all media with the exception of community newspapers in white sections of the city, endorsed and campaigned for the tax rate increase. The Republican Party refused to take a position, but the Republican candidate for governor did issue a statement in support of the increase. Many politicians of both parties joined their constituents in opposition.

In the past, we have carried bond and tax rate increases by a three-to-one majority, this time we carried by eighteen thousand votes. It was a light primary vote in Chicago, but the vote was not light in the white communities.

We closed the school year with our five hundred enrolled in the vacant seats of the white schools. Now, we are evaluating the results of the total program as envisaged in the recommendation. I do not have the complete analysis of staff evaluation as of now.

We are moving ahead on a magnet school, and we have plans under way for what we are calling a Cultural Educational Complex on a site adjacent to the University of Illinois. Each step in the implementation of recommendations has been made in a cooperative venture involving a university, the community and private and parochial schools.

When we have completed our buildings, we intend to involve the business community and the civic and social agencies in the total program of education.

Neighborhood school adherents are just as bitterly opposed to these developments as they are to transportation. It is not a case of our failure to communicate with them, nor of their not understanding what we are about. They are well informed, attend every board meeting, and wait in line for every report issued--or every speech made--anywhere in the city.

The reaction of the white community was a factor in the consideration of the consultants. What they did not anticipate was the rise of Black Nationalism.

There are many among the Negroes who are no longer concerned with integration. They want black schools, black teachers and principals. They want strong courses in Afro-American culture and history.

They want to find meaning and identity in Black Power. They see no virtue in integration that carries with it rejection.

They neither applaud nor condemn what we have done. They want good schools, better equipment, more services; and they want them now.

That we have, through this period, been developing in-service training for teachers and staff, holding certification examinations for many of our substitutes, experimenting with programs designed for specific school communities, searching out and promoting Negro administrators, making a concerted effort to fit principals to the schools in the communities--all seem to be of minor importance to some whites and some Negroes.

Yet all of these are part of the recommendations; and equally important in the minds of the consultants is the transportation of children.

It is difficult to assess how fast we are moving and with what success. The tumult at times seems louder than the cheers.

There has not been a moment since I arrived that could be called the time for taking inventory. Events and demands pile one upon another in a never-ending procession of problems and decision-makings.

Historically, the General Superintendent of Schools is the end of the line. He says "Yes" or "No" as the problems flow past in an assembly-line repetitiveness.

This thought brings me to a transition: the case study of Decentralization of the Administration of the Chicago Public Schools.

When I arrived in Chicago, Booz, Allen and Hamilton had been engaged by the Chicago Board of Education to make recommendations on organization and decentralization. The staff of Booz, Allen and Hamilton was already at work, interviewing administrators in the Chicago Public Schools.

Like civil rights activities, this study had its share of controversy before the Board of Education took definite action on it. By the time of my arrival, there were many who were anxious to have me establish my own reorganization before the study was completed.

The top administrative staff had been caught in that most untenable of positions--between the cross fire of controversy. It had incurred the enmity of many in the community, on the Board and in the press.

However, I found top staff willing, cooperative and helpful. I did not ask nor did I want to know what went on before I came. It was my Cabinet, and I wanted to work with them as I found them.

This did not please very many. The staff wondered what I thought. They were anxious to please if I would only tell them what I wanted done. While no one said anything to me directly, I was always aware of the question: When are you going to move and get new key people around you?

Impatience with me had reached a high point on this issue when the Booz, Allen and Hamilton Report was presented to the Board of Education.

The study recommended that the day-to-day operation and decision-making rest in the hands of a Deputy Superintendent. His office would be adequately staffed, with services now supervised by members of my Cabinet. Under the Deputy, there would be three Associate Superintendents, each in charge of an area of our city larger than many of the big cities of America. These offices, too, would be adequately staffed with personnel.

Reporting to the three area Associates are twenty-seven District Superintendents. Flexibility was permitted so that these District Superintendents could be used as community leaders or as assistants functioning in a special capacity.

The General Superintendent's office was to be staffed with specialists in the areas of Educational Program Planning, Facilities Planning, Financial Planning, Operations Analysis, Community Relations, and Human Relations.

The role of the General Superintendent was to be planner, counselor and supervisor. He was to have time to meet and participate in community affairs and to share with civic and government leaders as a school official in the long range plans of a modern city.

He was to be freed of the enormous amount of paper work so that he would have time to think and plan rather than constantly react to the proliferation of unmet circumstances that piled in upon him from all sections of the city, as is now the case.

Again, the Board of Education accepted the report in principle with the understanding that implementation of each recommendation would come back as a separate Board report.

I have already appointed two Administrative Assistants and the three area Associates. I have not yet named a Deputy.

This fall, we will start moving staff from the Central Office to the field offices of the area Associates. Until now, we have continued top staff assignments as they were in the past. We have appointed the assistants on the General Superintendent's staff. The Associate and assistants who are now filling the same or other roles will relinquish operational responsibilities.

In this beginning phase of decentralization, I do not expect the transition to be either easy or efficient. I do expect it to begin to release the personal initiative and imagination which have tended to wither and die under the efficiency of centralization.

I have no illusions that imagination and creativity will bloom immediately, either. You cannot tighten decision-making into the hands of a few and let this become a pattern for the past forty years without destroying initiative at the lower levels of administration.

Whatever we are doing, whether it be in decentralization or desegregation, we are doing the tasks with a limited amount of money. In our budget estimates last December, we said that it would take $174,000,000 to up-grade the quality of education and to adequately staff the enterprise.

As I mentioned in talking about the fifteen-cent tax increase, we still need sixteen million dollars to keep solvent between now and December 31, the close of our fiscal year. We are asking the Legislature in a postponed session going on this month to increase our State Aid.

One of the real frustrations in the urban school system is this financial inability to meet needs. There are ideas and there are programs which we know are needed and would solve many of the problems of education, but we cannot attempt them because--as Paul Mort once said--"We are still trying to hold education together with clips and rubber bands and sticking tape."

Yet, without money, decentralization is proving to me that the big city cannot be administered in any other way. It is heartening to come into cabinet meetings and hear the Associates talking about what we are doing with our district superintendents, principals, and teachers to meet specific school and community needs.

Less and less are we discussing city-wide educational diets; more and more are we getting to the heart of what must be done in the inner city, which is different from the school that resembles a suburban community school; and what must be done in the school that covers an industrial area; and in the school that serves fringe areas. Our administrators are accepting leadership responsibilities--and this is promising.

At no time have we talked about multiple boards of education. I do not believe that these are necessary to an effective program of decentralization. The Board of Education can set policy for the city as a whole. It can be the watchdog of those centralized services which lend themselves to efficiency without interfering with the education of a child.

Before I arrived, there had been a city-wide program for advisory groups to work with district superintendents. The plan had been worked out in the Central Office. All were to have the exact number on the Advisory Board; all should have representation in the same way; all should meet at the same time. It never really got under way. The district superintendents could not humanize their community relationships with an organizational chart that had no comprehension of their individual needs.

I do believe in community involvement and I do believe there are ways of achieving it. We are encouraging Councils in the districts. They are oriented to problems indigenous to the district. We will not use Councils for publicity purposes but to actually counsel with us about specific problems and needs. We will not gather them together for busywork nor to necessarily condone what we preach.

As we move ahead into the development of our magnet schools and educational-cultural complexes, I am sure that I will come to appreciate the flexibility which I see in decentralization as it is now beginning to function. If the complex is to be successful, it will require imagination and administrative leadership. It will call for the vision of a generalist who can see the totality of student, staff, community, business, private and parochial school relationship . . . . All that should be and must be participating in the involvement to make it work.

Decentralization, as I see it, must bring about that overworked cliché--sensitivity. More and more I am trying to say the same thing in a different way. Each of us in an administrative capacity in the Chicago Public Schools must listen more, observe more, comprehend more and understand more.

We have got to do this as a daily exercise if we are to function in a changing, complex, urban society. We must pool what we know, and we must share in what we do.

This is what we are about in Chicago. Yet, I do not want you to believe that all of this leads to consensus. There will never be a time when the office of the General Superintendent of Schools in any city will not be a lonely place for the man who sits there.

When he has reached the ultimate in democratic procedure through decentralization, he will still find that the final decisions which have to be made will come to him without benefit of a crystal ball. The "hard ones" never seem to go away.

Having finished the case studies, there still remains a haunting query:

What do you do with problems which transcend the law and go directly to the hearts of men?

What do you do to allay people's fears, uncertainties and distrust?

What are the profound words superintendents must utter that will get people to believe that they _do_ care about children--whatever the color of their skin, whatever their religion, whatever their nationality?

I wish I knew.

Yet, wherever I go these days, I--like other superintendents--am being asked for blunt straightforward answers to extremely complex problems. Our listeners like to believe that the answers are readily at hand; all we have to do is spell them out; and the turmoil of our society will disappear.

Unfortunately, society does not react in the precise way that we would like to have it perform.

As a society, people rebel against restrictions. Particularly do they rebel against those who have the unenviable task of pointing out how each must be curtailed if all are to survive in a megalopolis like Chicago; which megalopolis expands farther and farther from the core of the city, which still remains--for city and suburb--the basic unit.

The more I contemplate my own little niche in this vast, complex, interdependent, metropolitan giant called Chicago, the more I find it difficult to say what I _will_ or _can_ do. Sometimes it seems futile for me to say that I will have more and better schools, more land, better teaching, more and better programs of education. How am I to get them?

There is not one task facing me which does not in some way interfere with some individual's right to be left alone. I cannot move in the way of building schools, and rehabilitating and modernizing and tearing them down, or modifying instructional programs--unless the citizens determine that I have the hundreds of millions of dollars necessary to do the job.

I cannot adequately pay teachers, have small class size, separate the disturbed child from the normal child, provide programs of education which meet the vast range of abilities and aptitudes of all children--unless the citizens, the State of Illinois and the federal government provide me with the funds to meet these needs.

I cannot provide integrated education if people move across a given street and out of the school district.

These are the thoughts which race through my every waking moment and must race through the minds of every urban superintendent. How do we stir our cities, board members, staffs, citizens, students? How do we communicate so that each one of us becomes tremendously important in the solution of the problems which the cynic says are insoluble?

Today, in Chicago, there is a coming-together of professional people, business and industry, governmental officials, finance men, and religious leaders. Out of their combined efforts will come, I hope, solutions to the massive social problems of our city.

Cooperatively, we have a job to do: We must provide the means to make meaningful the educational experiences which will help each child to develop to his potential.

The task is not easy. Whatever is new or different seems to challenge our snug, comfortable feeling that the old ways are the safe ways.

If we do not learn to live and to work together, we must certainly look forward to more and greater problems. If we cannot find ways to maintain a fine and balanced city, we can only anticipate a bleak and desolate metropolitan area.

Nationally known civil rights leader, James Farmer, formerly director of CORE and currently an Adjunct Professor at New York University, predicts that the "terrible" responsibilities and problems of school officials "will grow more complex rather than simpler." Despite the efforts that were made during the decade after 1954 by black leaders to push for real integration of the nation's schools, there has been only token integration in the south, and in northern cities schools have been becoming more and more segregated. Mr. Farmer adds that more black Americans are sensing the immediate need to develop pride, self-esteem and self-awareness; in Mr. Farmer's words, the "need to develop an identity, a sense of cohesiveness." Mr. Farmer declares that while integration is a value which must be cherished as the ultimate objective in a multi-racial society, current demographic realities in the cities preclude the possibility of large scale desegregation. Mr. Farmer envisions decentralization and community control as a necessary forerunner and the ultimate partner to true integration.

SOME VIEWS ON THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN DECENTRALIZATION AND RACIAL INTEGRATION IN LARGE CITY SCHOOL SYSTEMS

James Farmer, Adjunct Professor,
New York University

The story is told about Gertrude Stein that as she lay on her deathbed a friend walked in and said, "Gertrude, Gertrude, what is the answer?" She opened her eyes briefly and said, "What's the question?" and then died.

Today, even the questions we ask are changing--and answers that appeared to be absolutely clear, accurate and precise at one time now seem obsolete and archaic. I had a call from an old friend of mine not too long ago. I had not seen him for many years, and as he spoke it was obvious that he was utterly dumbfounded. "Jim," he said, "I'm baffled and puzzled. I don't know whether I'm coming or going. I'm catching it from left and right." "What's the problem?" I asked him. He said, "A few years ago, you so-called civil-rights leaders told me that the militant, progressive and important thing to do was to integrate a lily-white suburb. So my wife and I took you at your word. We took the bull by the horns and we moved out to Lovely Lane, next door to Gorgeous Garden; we bought a split-level house and mowed the lawn. And we faced all the garbage, and rocks through the window, and the burning crosses, and the isolation. Now--we have overcome. We are invited by our neighbors for cocktails, and we have them over for tea. But now we are called 'Uncle Toms' for living out there with all those white folks."

Shortly after this incident, I had the privilege of being in one of the large cities, participating in or leading a series of seminars sponsored by the Board of Education of that city. In the course of the conversation, several officials informed me that the Board would very shortly propose a total desegregation plan that would eliminate *de facto* segregation in one fell swoop. Lapsing into silence, I recalled that ten or twelve years ago, when we were battling in that city for school desegregation, the Board of Education would not acknowledge that it *had* any segregation. The Board's position was, "Surely this must be a case of mistaken identity. You must be talking about Mississippi, and this is not Mississippi. We have no segregation here." A few years later the Board acknowledged that there *was* segregation in the city, but said, "Ours is different because it's *de facto* and not *de jure*, and therefore it is both outside our field of competence and beyond our jurisdiction. After all," maintained the Board, "we are not the Housing Authority, we are the Education

Authority." Shortly thereafter, the Board acknowledged that it was its responsibility to confront and alleviate segregation. The Board was not sure what to do. Now, I was informed, the Board had a total plan, which would eliminate the problem. Regrettably for the unquestionably well-intentioned Board members, they must realize that--even if the plan is all that it is supposed to be--they must be prepared for the fact that when they announce it it will meet a lukewarm reception from a large segment of the black community; and from the smaller segments of that community it will meet outright hostility. They would be kidding themselves if they did not confront that fact--because the agenda and the priorities for many have changed.

Why have they changed? Without doubt they have changed because of our failures of the past--and by "our" I mean all of us, black and white--our failure to achieve desegregation. And we have failed. The fact of the matter is that residential segregation all over the land is increasing, not decreasing. Increasingly in our large cities there is the pattern of the black core and the white noose--as the inner city becomes more and more black, and the surrounding ring of suburbs becomes whiter and tighter. Along with this development comes, of course, increasing de facto school segregation. Some of the Southern cities I've observed are now, in fact, seeking to move from de jure to de facto segregation. I have watched several that are using urban renewal to uproot those areas which traditionally have been racially integrated. Housing is built, and individuals and families are moved so as to create segregation. If that pattern is followed then before too long these Southerners will be able to say, as their northern brothers have already said, "Why, we're not defying any Supreme Court decision. Anybody who lives in this school district is perfectly free to go to the schools. It just so happens--accidentally--they are all white, and these people are all black."

So we find that--while our focus has been aimed at abolishing segregation--segregation, in fact, has been increasing. We have also been failing economically, because the gap between the average income of black Americans and white Americans has been widening, not narrowing. What we have succeeded in doing in the past few years of our feverish activity, when many of our heads were broken, and many of us knew the insides of countless jails, is to improve the upward mobility of those black persons who have achieved some education and who have a little money. But the same is not true, statistics show, of the black high-school graduates. Among black high-school graduates unemployment now is nearly as high as unemployment among black high-school dropouts. Still, for black college graduates, it is easy to get a job. Business and government agencies are seeking them. At the end of the year at Lincoln University, for example, a large number of companies had representatives on campus looking for the services of these educated, trained, personable young black men and women. Some of us naturally suspected that the motives of the companies were not wholly above suspicion: big business is concerned with its public image. A friend of mine called and said, "Jim, I've just been hired by a big corporation at a fine salary and guess what? I don't have to do anything but sit near the door and look like a Negro." Later he was fired because he wasn't dark enough--the company wanted someone with greater visibility. My point is that while we have improved the mobility of the middle class who have the tools--those without the tools, without the skills, without the education, without the money, have slipped back; and the gap has widened. Unquestionably the poor are becoming poorer while the rest of society gains in affluence. This fact has rudely interrupted our dreams in recent years and many of us have been kept awake nights pondering the problem, indeed the fear, that while we have opened the doors very slightly to equal opportunity, nevertheless the masses of black Americans may very well be precisely where they were before those victories were won.

It is also becoming quite apparent in the black communities that the economic discrepancy has a correlate in education. With respect to most black children, the educational establishment has utterly failed. We must confront the fact that the schools have not educated the poor black children. Consider the Harlems and the Bedford-Stuyvesants and the Watts's. The figures and statistics are well-known, but it bears repeated emphasis that not infrequently students coming out of high-school read at a third and fourth-grade level. In my own community of Bedford-Stuyvesant, figures show that only one-third of those entering high school graduate. Of the one-third that do graduate, 87% receive the so-called "general diploma" which prepares them literally for nothing; as opposed to the academic diplomas preparing for college, the commercial diplomas preparing for office work, or technical diplomas for vocational or technical jobs. A kid says, "I'm going to make it now, I've got the piece of paper, I didn't drop out like that fool over there did. Now watch my smoke!" And he finds that the piece of paper is meaningless. A cruel hoax has been played on him. All of the failures of the schools have become abundantly clear to the parents and the black community at large; and that is why the focus is on the educational issue in the black community. Probably more stress is laid on this issue than on any other. I hesitate to say that there is one issue, or one problem, which should have top priority, and that all the others are secondary or tertiary or what have you--because they are all very much interrelated. Unless we work on all of them simultaneously, as Kenneth Clark points out, the work that we do on any one is probably going to fail. But if there is one that is more fundamental than the others, cutting across all of the areas, it is education; and this, then, is where the focus has to be.

In the past, the educational thrust of the civil rights movement has been exclusively on dispersing black children into white schools and white communities. In the late fifties practically no black leaders would have dared to speak of improving the school facilities within the ghetto communities themselves, because such a position would have been seen as tantamount to advocating continued segregation. It was rather confidently felt that segregation would prove short-lived and soon all of the blacks would be dispersed, roughly in a one to ten ratio; so that you would perhaps have to have a countdown in reverse to find one of us--you know, 6,7,8,9, ah, there you are, the tenth man. To demonstrate how many of us, including myself, held the dispersionist view almost singlemindedly, let me recount briefly a personal experience. I visited university and college campuses in the late fifties, and very generally some white students would come to me and say, "Mr. Farmer, we don't understand the Negro students." "Why not?" "They seem clannish, they stick together. Two of them come to the dining hall together for dinner, and they sit together." And I would ask, "What would you expect?" And the answer was, "One should sit over there, and one over there, so they would be fully integrated." Obviously that would be an absurdity. Since the two had something in common, they had experiences in common, they could discuss interests in common and so forth, they sat together. Still, we held that kind of dispersionist view then. However, as I tried to emphasize earlier, there has not been dispersion but increased segregation.

Why, then, did we exclusively seek integration or dispersal? There are several reasons. The first, which was most valid and which is still valid, I would like to underscore. That is that there is an educational value in integrated education. There is an educational value in black children and white children from all ethnic backgrounds, from all kinds of previous experiences, learning to get along with each other and to study with one another. That is as valid now as it ever was. There was a second reason, too, which was somewhat degrading of the black man. This was the feeling on the part of some that black people could not learn if they were alone, that they had to be with whites to learn. Well, now I would reject that view. I think it is possible for black kids to learn with only blacks, just as white kids in the suburbs manage to learn in the company of their all-white classmates. Unquestionably in a racially homogenous school or classroom the social experiences of the children are not as rich as they could or should be. But the point is that there is no reason why black children cannot learn when surrounded only by their fellow blacks. Finally, the third reason was purely tactical or political. This was the assumption that if we said our schools were bad, that they were inadequate, that we had the least experienced teachers, the poorest facilities, and the most overcrowded classrooms, and if we could get our youngsters into the white schools, then we would take advantage of white power to insure good education for our children. In other words, the assumption was that the white middle class parents were going to see to it that their children had first-class schools. They would use their political power, they would call city hall, they would call the superintendent, they would call the state house, and they would see that they had the best education possible and we blacks then could ride on the swell of the white tidal wave. This assumption has not proved correct. It has not worked because many of the white parents have left the city and we have had increased segregation. They have gone out to the suburbs where they were away from us and thus we did not reap the advantages of their political power.

I want to make it quite clear, however, that I still maintain that integration is a value which we must cherish as an objective--as an ultimate objective. I want to state, just as strongly, my view that it is important that black Americans now develop a sense of cohesiveness and develop a pride. These two things are not contradictory, because America has not been really a "melting-pot" in the common sense of the word, where all people have become one. What it has been is--if I may use another cliché--cultural pluralism, a pluralistic culture where people can acknowledge, respect and honor their heritage and their background, their history; and at the same time learn to respect the history, background and heritage of others.

Thus, what I advocate is this: I would seek to achieve as much desegration as is possible; remembering, however, that in our big cities now, considering the ethnic population and the population shifts, it will not be possible to have total desegregation. Look at Washington, D.C., where 93 percent of the school population is black. There are no whites with whom to integrate unless we can import them. So I say that we dare not, we dare not now neglect the education--and thus the futures--of our children who in the foreseeable future will be going to school in the hearts of those black ghettoes. Indeed, we need to place a special effort there.

This kind of reasoning forms the basis for the current demands by the black community for community participation in school affairs and indeed a large measure of community control. Such reasoning is in fact at the heart of the school decentralization movement. I must confess, however, that I do not view community control or decentralization as essentially an educational matter. I view it as fundamentally a social matter, and a social thrust. It is the desire of masses of people to participate in decision-making. Its importance lies in that it changes our democracy from an elitist democracy to a populist democracy, whereby people who in the past have been excluded from the decision-making process can be included. But, very frankly, community control does not ipso facto mean higher quality education. It may remain the same, it may be better, it may be worse. There is no guarantee that it will be any one of these three; it depends on what we do with community control. I think, therefore, it is a valid social thrust; but not fundamentally an educational thrust.

But the social dimensions of decentralization, strong as they are, do not provide its only rationale. The black parents who are pressing for local control of the schools do have one very potent strength, and that is a passionate concern for the future of their children. Somehow the boards of education and the professional educators must utilize that passion and that concern, because the greatest interest in the black community now is the quality of the children's education. Some polls support my point of view. A recent public opinion poll, conducted by a Bedford-Stuyvesant restoration corporation in the Bedford-Stuyvesant area in Brooklyn, showed that on the school issue the major concern was "the highest quality education possible for our kids because we want our kids to stand on our shoulders, so to speak; to have a better chance at life than we." To be sure, there are activists on one side who feel that the way to accomplish this end is through integration. There are others who feel that the way to do it is through building up the cohesiveness of the black school. But these are the activists. The masses are concerned chiefly with the quality of education which their children receive.

I believe that both of the tactics of the activists are right, and that there is a pendulum swinging. First the pendulum swung exclusively to dispersion or integration.

Now among many of my colleagues it swings exclusively toward cohesion, or, if you prefer, a neo-separation. I think that the swing of the pendulum will narrow and if it comes to rest it will come to rest between the two.

I would like to emphasize again the necessity of the black American to develop his pride and identity. I observed one school up in Syracuse where efforts toward this end are meeting considerable success. It's Croton-on-Campus, where Syracuse University is working with the Board of Education. A school was selected which was _de facto_ segregated, 90 to 95 percent black. A park and a building were erected for it on the Syracuse campus, using all of the laboratory and other facilities of the University. Teachers volunteered to come to the school and to make a special effort to improve the self-image of the black students. A measurable improvement in their self-image has been noted; and this should be regarded as a very necessary achievement. Imagine a black child who has been taught that he is inferior; that his skin is a kind of deformity; that his kinky hair is "bad" and straight hair is "good"; that what he _is_ is bad and what others are is good and something which he should seek. It is this kind of programming which must be overcome if our black children are to develop racial pride and identity. It is this racial programming that the Kerner Commission Report was talking about. It is _not_ saying that all of us are bigots. It _is_ saying that we have all been in a way programmed to perpetuate the racism in our culture. Thus, the issue goes beyond that of individual racism, and I believe that we would be well advised, all of us, to examine our institutions and see how they can be used as change agents to help remove racism from American culture.

One of the fundamental institutions to be examined is the schools. Traditionally we have demanded that the schools perpetuate our "American values" as part of their educative function. One of these, whether we care to admit it or not, has been the concept of inferiority and superiority of races, particularly that black people are inferior. I do not suggest that an individual superintendent or principal or teacher himself may be prejudiced, but the system has often, in subtle ways, built prejudice in. For example, one of the questions asked in some standardized tests which I know are used in various cities has three pictures: a picture of a man in a tuxedo, a picture of a man in work clothes, a picture of a man in a business suit; and the question asked is: Which of these pictures shows a father going to work? Now, obviously there is a built-in cultural bias; and the poor black youngster in the ghetto, who perhaps has never seen his father in a business suit except Sunday when he puts on his go-to-meeting clothes, would give the wrong answer. The child whose parent is a waiter or even a musician going to work in the uniform of his trade would also give the wrong answer; for obviously the correct answer is the man in the business suit. Here is the built-in cultural bias. With that and similar questions, the child finds himself trapped in a lower track, and he comes out of school like the 87% in Bedford-Stuyvesant with a general diploma, when in large measure it has been the built-in cultural bias which has doomed him there. Perhaps worse still is the blow to his racial pride that such cultural biases always, if only implicitly, contain.

Our major institutions, including the schools, have been guilty of perpetuating such racist programming--inadvertently perhaps. (I am not one who holds to the conspiracy theory of history, or to the bad-man theory.) But in spite of all the good will in the world on the part of individuals, the system has built the black man in as the low man on the totem pole. Now we must try to make those institutions agents of change for society. We must see that the educational institutions reverse this racism and allow black people to develop pride and to say, indeed, black is beautiful. That does not mean that what is not black is ugly. That message must be gotten across, too. It is not necessary to hate someone else in order to love oneself. Indeed, I assert that if one does love himself, as a person and as a group member, then he does not need to hate anyone else; for he is secure in himself and in what he is. It is insecurity that forces him to hate.

Thus I see decentralization and community control as really being a forerunner to integration; and, in a larger sense, a partner to integration. There really is no contradiction, no paradox in this statement. Control of the schools, an exercise in populist democracy, is essential for developing the self-image and self-respect of the black community. Only after the full flowering of the black self-image, and after the elimination of cultural biases from all our institutions, especially the schools, can there be complete integration. I see the Black-American as integrated as we can make him today, developing his pride, his self-esteem, his self-awareness. He must become a hyphenated American like the other Americans; like the Irish-Americans who, when they faced Jim Crow in signs in windows (Man Wanted: No Irish Need Apply), sang songs which said "It's an honor to be born an Irishman." For the Irish it was absolutely necessary, when told it was a dishonor to be Irish, to maintain their self-respect by saying it was an honor. Likewise the Black-American needs to sing his songs. He needs to develop his hyphen today. Yet he must not lose sight of the losing of the hyphen and becoming an American. It will be more difficult for him than it has been for the others because of his high visibility. Others, who in their first or second generation looked like the people outside their ghettoes, their slums, could easily be assimilated into the outside society, merge with it, and be absorbed; but it is not easy for the Black-American because you can always see him. And it doesn't help him to change his name. He's still there. Nevertheless, it is still possible--more difficult, but possible--for him to become a real member of our society. We must not lose the

the ultimate objective, the ideal, of his becoming a full-fledged American citizen. His destiny is here in this country; and we must now, as always, work toward the ultimate goal of one society and one nation, and toward healing the split and uniting our divided society.

We must not lose sight of that. But at the same time we must live in the here and now. I know it is not an easy matter for the nation to be made color-blind. It is not now color-blind--it must somehow become color-blind. But the becoming is a very difficult and a complex process.

Educational administrators, probably more than the professional civil-rights workers at the present time, have considerable responsibility and power in this regard. Educators have the power to prepare young black people to enter the mainstream of the nation's life; to honor themselves and at the same time to honor men's interdependence; to develop cohesiveness and at the same time to build bridges.

Terry Francois of the N.A.A.C.P. in San Francisco made a suggestion which I think deserves considerable exploration. In discussing educational parks and other such complexes, he suggested that when we have these we ought to have released time for different ethnic groups to study their own history--not closing the door to others, but letting others in, if they desire, to learn about that history. It is just as important for white Americans to learn about Black-Americans' history, and about Africa, as it is for Black-Americans to learn about it. And if the

Black-American wishes to go into the released time class for Mexican-Americans to learn their history--or German-Americans, or Italian-Americans, or Polish-Americans--then why not let him do it? Perhaps in that way we can help to learn the lesson that we all, black and white, must grasp: that we are all Americans, we are all humans, and that is more important than blackness or whiteness.

Humanity does transcend color. But remember--one cannot really love humanity unless he also loves himself. If he rejects and hates himself, then it is not possible for him to love mankind of which he is a part. But the other side of the coin is also true--it's really not possible for him to love himself unless he also at the same time learns to love humanity of which he is a part.

2,000 years ago, Hillel said, "If I am not for myself who will be for me? If I am for myself alone, what am I? And if not now, when?"

SECTION III

SOME CONCLUDING COMMENTS

Our paramount goal in this publication has been to disseminate as expeditiously as possible a series of speeches which help to crystallize and delineate the relationships between school integration and decentralization. It is not the purpose of this brief concluding section either to review or to attempt to synthesize the preceding presentations. However, several of the recurrent and transcendent themes which permeated discussion at the Institute should at least be identified briefly, even if in a necessarily tenuous and preliminary manner. Their implications for educational decision-makers are indeed profound.

It was made abundantly clear by speakers at the Institute that school superintendents and others who are involved in establishing educational policy cannot detach themselves from the currents of broad social upheaval and change. Repeatedly, speakers and consultants from divergent disciplines warned that administrators and board of education members who avoid all issues which do not seem directly related to formal schooling will soon see their policy making prerogatives usurped by other groups.

It was the judgment of many Institute participants that there is a vigorous thrust for creating a broader base in educational policy making, and that this demand for participation must be accommodated. Again, unless the form of that accommodation is determined by school administrators and board members, others will seize policy making initiatives. There are many manifestations of this increasing demand for broader participation in educational policy making. They include federal Anti-Poverty and Model City programs, the civil rights movement, the approach of the new Urban Coalition, and the demands for school decentralization and community control.

While Institute participants held different opinions as to how the new challenges should be met, it was generally agreed that school leaders must find immediate means of interacting more closely with a whole range of diverse institutions and individuals heretofore considered "non-school."

It was also contended at the Institute that public school educators must be more actively involved in mitigating urban blight and thus must concern themselves more directly with such issues as welfare, housing and employment. Speakers suggested that there will probably be some erosion of the traditional separation of school government from general government at the local, state and federal levels.

This closer relationship between the schools and general government no doubt would pull educational officials more deeply into non-school related politics. It seems axiomatic that only through engagement in the political process can substantive changes in major public policy areas like education be effectuated. Discussion at the Institute indicated that the myth which all too commonly prevails--that schoolmen somehow are totally divorced from politics--is being shattered dramatically in cities throughout the country. Schools, of course, generally should be insulated, for example, from the vagaries of blatant ward politics. It is myopic and naive, however, to contend realistically that city school systems, which are so often the focal points of criticism, can succeed in their complex responsibilities if they are detached from general government. Improvement in schooling for the urban poor, for example, must be paralleled, by concomitant improvements in housing and employment opportunities as well.

The Institute explored these issues and others related to the major theme--the relationship between decentralization and integration. It was the contention of the majority that school decentralization--however defined--and the objective of racial integration are not mutually exclusive or necessarily incompatible.

Indeed, several speakers and other participants advanced the argument that, given the present demographic facts of life in some of the larger urban areas, decentralization is often a necessary precursor to ultimate, meaningful integration. Most speakers also agreed that the difficulties peculiar to the very large cities should not be a deterrent to pursuing the goal of racially integrating schools in smaller communities where integration plans may be more viable.

Finally, a number of the speakers maintained that any realistic hope for improving urban schools must be predicated upon the development of creative metropolitan area approaches to resolving educational problems. Such solutions, it was agreed, could be successful only if buttressed by massive infusions of federal and state funds which would stimulate regional plans to eliminate *de facto* segregation and racial discrimination.

Appendix A

WORK CONFERENCE AND INSTITUTE PARTICIPANTS

Medill Bair
Superintendent of Schools
Hartford, Connecticut

Albert Benson
Superintendent of Schools
North Reading, Massachusetts

Forbes Bottomly
Superintendent of Schools
Seattle, Washington

S. C. Brissie
Superintendent of Schools
Lyman, South Carolina

Harold R. Collins
Superintendent of Schools
Troy, Alabama

John J. Connor, Jr.
Superintendent of Schools
Worcester, Massachusetts

Matthew W. Costanzo
District Superintendent
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Neil E. Cross
Superintendent of Schools
Manchester Center, Vermont

Bruce Crosswait
Superintendent of Schools
Brookings, South Dakota

Jack P. Crowther
Superintendent of Schools
Los Angeles, California

Arthur W. Dennis
Superintendent of Schools
Cullman, Alabama

Norman Drachler
Superintendent of Schools
Detroit, Michigan

Peter J. Dugan
Superintendent of Schools
Englewood, New Jersey

Alton U. Farnsworth
Superintendent of Schools
Guilderland Center, New York

Robert W. Gaddis
County Superintendent of
Schools
Board of Education
Snow Hill, Maryland

Robert D. Gilberts
Superintendent of Schools
Denver, Colorado

Richard P. Gousha
Superintendent of Schools
Milwaukee, Wisconsin

Robert J. Gover
Superintendent of Schools
Elkton, Kentucky

Joe W. Harper
Superintendent of Schools
McKinney, Texas

John H. Harris
Director of Metropolitan
Schools
Nashville, Tennessee

Florence M. Hawkins
Assistant Superintendent of
Schools
Boston, Massachusetts

Howard B. Henderson
Regional Superintendent
St. Catharines, Ontario,
Canada

Harry R. Henley
Superintendent of Schools
Havertown, Pennsylvania

Charles W. Iles
Superintendent of Schools
Kent, Washington

Raymond M. Jansen
District Superintendent
Lodi, California

Duane R. Lund
Superintendent of Schools
Staples, Minnesota

Bernard J. McCormick
Superintendent of Schools
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

Richard P. McLean
Superintendent of Schools
Endicott, New York

Joseph Manch
Superintendent of Schools
Buffalo, New York

William D. Overstreet
Superintendent of Schools
Juneau, Alaska

Orvin L. Plucker
Superintendent of Schools
Kansas City, Kansas

James F. Redmond
Superintendent of Schools
Chicago, Illinois

Thomas L. Reeves
Superintendent of Schools
Long Beach, Mississippi

John W. Reng
Superintendent of Schools
Lander, Wyoming

William C. Robinson
Superintendent of Schools
Manhattan, Kansas

Gabriel E. Seguin
Assistant Superintendent
Ontario Department of
Education
Toronto, Ontario,
Canada

John F. Stephens
General Superintendent
Longmont, Colorado

N. A. Sweetman
Superintendent of Schools
Toronto, Ontario,
Canada

Justin W. Swenson
Superintendent of Schools
Moorhead, Minnesota

George E. Theobald
Deputy Superintendent of
Schools
Cleveland, Ohio

Mark C. Wayne
Superintendent of Schools
North Syracuse, New York

J. K. Williams
Superintendent of Schools
Blytheville, Arkansas

Thomas D. Wogaman
Assistant Superintendent of Schools
Berkeley, California

Victor C. Wood
Superintendent of Schools
Oregon, Ohio

SPECIAL CONSULTANTS TO THE INSTITUTE

Roderick A. Hilsinger
Director of the Urban Education Institute For Development of Educational Activities
The Kettering Foundation

George R. LaNoue
Associate Professor of Government and Education
Teachers College
Columbia University

David Seeley
Public Education Association
New York City

Miss June Shagaloff
Education Director
NAACP

Seymour Warkov
Associate Professor of Sociology and Education
Teachers College
Columbia University

David E. Wilder
Research Associate
Bureau of Applied Social Research
Columbia University